NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

The Historic Resources of the Chicago Park District

B. Associated Historic Contexts

The Historical Development of Public Parks in Chicago since 1839

C. Geographical Data

The City limits of Chicago, Illinois

☐ See continuation sheet

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

Signature of certifying official — Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper of the National Register — Date

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

INTRODUCTION

By its very nature, an urban park is a constantly changing form. In addition to the fact that landscapes are composed of natural and transitory materials, urban parks are shaped by a variety of societal forces. These social, cultural, economic, and political forces affect a park's programs, activities, design, appearance, and physical development. The initial creation of parks is often driven by social movements to improve conditions of the city, either in general, or targeted to a particular neighborhood. Subsequent significant alterations in the parks are influenced by many of the factors listed above including changing patterns in transportation, recreational trends, available funding, crime and security issues, and other political considerations. While it is a combination of these factors which truly shapes the development of a park, one of the key aspects is the framework of policies and legislation through which parks could be created and improved. By focusing on the history of public policy and major legislative decisions related to the development of parklands in Chicago, Illinois, a historic context for the urban park property type is generated. This historic context statement will provide a structure for evaluating the social history, recreational trends, architectural and landscape architectural design significance of Chicago's parks. However, a more detailed significance statement related to those aspects of the historic context is provided in section F of this document.

This nomination covers a period which commences with the creation of the first documented park in 1839, two years after Chicago incorporated as a city. While the beginning point of this nomination is clear, the historic development of Chicago's parks is characterized by overlapping movements and trends, rather than a simple linear chronology. Thus, an outline has been developed which appears three times in the body of this cover document: the historic context statement (E), the description statement (F, Part II) and the significance statement (F, Part III) for the urban park property type.

The outline is composed of five major sections, with several sub-sections. The first section, Chicago's Early Parks 1839-1869, begins with the city's first documented park and covers the period prior to the emergence of formal open space policies. The next section, the Creation of the Three Original Park Commissions 1869-1934, addresses the legislation which established the South, West, and Lincoln Park systems and mandated the creation of the initial parks and boulevards. This section also documents the development of those parks up to 1934, the year in which the individual park districts were consolidated to a single agency, the Chicago Park District. The third section is entitled the Three Original Park Commissions' Ability to Create Additional Parklands 1899-1934. It discusses the South, West, and Lincoln Park Commissions' efforts to develop additional parks through new legislation generated by the Progressive Reform Movement. This section includes the creation of new parklands along Chicago's south lakefront. The fourth section, Parks and Boulevards of the Nineteen Additional Park Commissions 1895-1934 deals with a movement generated by neighborhoods unserved by the original three commissions to improve streets and establish parks in their own areas. The last section, the Consolidation of the Twenty Two Superseded Park Districts in 1934 addresses the development nearly all of the parks in the city, under the stewardship of the Chicago Park District, which occurred during the Works Progress Administration.

CHICAGO'S EARLY PARKS 1839-1869

Though it had adopted the motto "Urbs in Horto" ("City set in a Garden"), Chicago had few official policies relating to the acquisition or stewardship of public open space prior to 1869. The city had little parkland, and that which it did have was often left undeveloped and unplanned. Dearborn Park (which no longer exists) is considered Chicago's first park. It was established in 1839 on a portion of what had been Fort Dearborn. The land had been reluctantly donated to the City by the United States government after Fort Dearborn was discontinued (Chicago City Manual. 1914, pp. 7).

☒ See continuation sheet

Most of the other parks which were established before 1869 resulted from the donation or sale of lands at reduced rates by real estate developers. According to the Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.) Historic Register these "enterprising men" were "subdividing land, widening streets, planting trees along their sides, decorating adjoining grass plots with urns of flowers and doing all the things of the day calculated to start real estate booms" (W.P.A, pp. 570). Though the City benefitted from the ownership of these properties, these developers were clearly interested in establishing parks and boulevards as a means of enhancing their own real estate investments. John S. Wright was one such developer whose vision transcended his own real estate holdings. He conceived of a city-wide system of grand parks linked together with broad tree-lined boulevards. Though Wright's idea eventually became the genesis of one of the nation's first boulevard systems, at the time it did not become a reality. The city had not developed a comprehensive program for parks. Rather, it continued the piecemeal approach of purchasing and accepting donations of land.

The history of Washington Square is representative of parklands created by real estate speculators. Composed of a three acre plot of land, it was donated to the City in 1842 by James Fitch, Orasmua Bushnell, and Charles Butler of the American Land Company for use as a public square. Union and Vernon Parks also represent the way in which the early parks were initially created and continued to evolve. The property which became Union Park was owned by developers Reuben Taylor and Billy Carpenter. They successfully lobbied the City in 1853 to purchase the property at a reduced rate. No improvements took place until 1865, and even after that newspapers referred to the Park as a "cow pasture with a few dying trees" (Breen, pp. 571). After the West Park Commission came into existence in 1869 (see below), Union Park went through several significant changes. Vernon Park, which was later renamed Victor Arrigo Park, is composed of property which was donated to the city by Henry D. Gilpin in 1857. It, too, was largely undeveloped and unimproved until the West Park Commission took possession of it in 1885.

The history of Lincoln Park is also representative of the piecemeal and continuous way in which the early parks evolved. In 1828, the federal government ceded part of what is now Lincoln Park to the State of Illinois to aid in the construction of the Illinois and Michigan Canal. The City of Chicago purchased some of this property in 1842 for a burial ground which was named Chicago Cemetery (Breen, pp. 131). Lincoln Park also played an important role in the social reform movement of the mid-to-late nineteenth century which ultimately led to the creation of park systems. Concern about the cemetery's threat to public health led to a city ordinance prohibiting the additional sale of lots in the cemetery. In 1860, a citizen committee petitioned the Common Council to set a portion of the property aside for park land. The Council adopted the recommendation and "Lake Park" was established. The park was renamed "Lincoln Park" in 1865, and by the following year its boundaries were expanded and further burials were forbidden. Between 1865 and 1868 approximately $30,000 was appropriated by the city for landscaping. The donation of a pair of mute swans from Central Park in New York in 1868 became the inception of Lincoln Park Zoo. (Discussion about the development of Lincoln Park under the stewardship of the Lincoln Park Commission is included in the following section. Subsequent additions and alterations to the Park, conducted by the Chicago Park District after 1934, are discussed in the last section.)

THE CREATION OF THE THREE ORIGINAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1869-1934

Throughout the 1860s there was growing concern about the inadequate amount and quality of parkland in the city. As a result, three groups of prominent citizens from the South, West, and North sides, independently became organized to address the need for open land. In 1867, a bill to create a park commission was drafted by South side advocates of park improvement . The bill, which focussed specifically on the South side, received approval in the State Legislature, but was defeated by popular vote. West side residents had been developing a bill which would apply to the entire City of Chicago. When they learned that the South side group was working on a bill specific to their territory, the West siders did the same. In 1869, the West side and South side groups introduced bills to create separate park commissions with distinct and exclusive authority. Due to the previous failure, proponents of the bills made great efforts to lobby for the effective passage of the bills.

Residents of the North side were active as well. They had successfully lobbied for the allocation of City funding for Lincoln Park improvements in the mid-1860s. Like their counterparts on the South and West sides, they were aware of the need for public policy, and drafted their own bill, entitled the Lincoln Park Act (Breen. pp. 134). The bill was somewhat different from those proposed by the other two groups. Though it did propose the creation of a separate park district, the Lincoln Park Act did not establish the new park district as a municipal corporation. The advocates for a Lincoln Park District had originally intended to levy taxes. However, in order to do so, the Act would have required approval by popular vote. Aware of the previous problems encountered by the South and West side advocates, the North side group amended the Lincoln Park Act to stipulate that the lands would be regulated by public officials, but would not empower the new Lincoln Park District to levy taxes. Thus, the bill could be passed without going to popular vote. Due to this difference in the way that the Lincoln Park Commission was established, proposed budgets had to be submitted to the town supervisors of Lake View and North Chicago before any taxes could be levied (Halsey, 1940, pp. 16).

All three bills were approved by State Legislature in February of 1869. Shortly thereafter, the South side and West side bills received approval by popular vote . The three bills were entirely separate. Each one specified the number of Commissioners on the Board, and how the members would be selected. Further, the bills specified the boundaries within the jurisdiction of each park system, and mandated the properties to be improved as parklands.

South Park Commission

The South Park Act of February 24, 1869 chartered the formation of the South Park Commission. It specified that a five member Board of Commissioners would be appointed by the Governor. The Act included a provision which stated that future appointments would be made by the Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County. The South Park Commission was given the responsibility of serving a geographic area from the Chicago River south to 138th Street and from Lake Michigan west to Cicero Ave. Its jurisdiction included the towns of South Chicago, Hyde Park and Lake.

The Act defined the boundaries of the 360 acres of property to be purchased for South Park Commission park and boulevard land. The grounds included what was originally known as North

Park and Lower Park, later called the West and East Parks and finally renamed Washington and Jackson Parks. They were linked together by a boulevard, the Midway Plaisance. Land transfers began in 1869 and the landscape architectural firm of Olmsted and Vaux was retained to "execute plans and supervise the work of transforming the acquired properties from their original barren state to the semblance of parks" (Breen, pp. 389). Olmsted and Vaux prepared and submitted a detailed report which included plans and specifications relative to the entire South Park System. The Board of Commissioners formally adopted Olmsted and Vaux's plan (South Park Commission (S.P.C., First Annual Report, 1872).

A variety of setbacks limited the execution of the plans to a slow, though continuous, pace. There were financial difficulties during the first few years of the South Park Commission's history. The land was more expensive than originally expected, and the sums available for land improvements were inadequate. The Chicago Fire of 1871 had a terrible impact on the South Park Commission. Though the parklands were not directly affected by the fire, the Commission office, which housed all of the records including the assessment rolls, was destroyed. This proved a serious financial setback, as no taxes could be levied until the tax rolls were re-established in 1873. In the spring of 1872, the more cautious Commission hired landscape architect, H.W.S. Cleveland, to oversee the implementation of the Olmsted and Vaux plan.

The construction of Washington Park occurred at a fairly rapid pace. However, the Jackson Park site had received only minimal attention from the South Park Commission. In fact, only about 15% of the Olmsted and Vaux plan had been implemented for this section of South Park by 1880 (Vinci and Christy, 1982). Thus, when an Act of Congress in 1890 authorized the World's Columbian Exposition and awarded its site to Chicago, Jackson Park became the obvious location. Frederick Law Olmsted was appointed as Chief Landscape Architect and Daniel H. Burnham as Chief Architect for the design and planning of the Fair. After the Columbian Exposition closed down, Olmsted's firm resumed its relationship with the South Park Commission, with the redesign of Jackson Park. The Burnham firm also continued to receive numerous architectural commissions from the South Park system after this period.

West Park Commission

The West Park Act, which was approved by the State Legislature in February and popular vote in March of 1869 established a seven member Board of West Park Commissioners to be appointed by the Governor. The geographic area within the jurisdiction of the West Park Commission encompassed all of the town of West Town, and the western division of Chicago. The Act allowed for the expansion of these boundaries with future increases of the limits of West Town.

Three sites for large parks had been broadly defined by the legislation. Soon after the West Park Board of Commissioners began meeting formally, it divided into three committees to define the exact boundaries of parks and boulevards, and develop a plan for land acquisition. Each of the three parks was approximately 200 acres in size. The committees facilitated the necessary land acquisition. There was North Park, (which was later renamed Humboldt Park); Middle Park, (which became Central Park, and was eventually renamed Garfield Park); and South Park (which became Douglas Park). Boulevards linked the three parks together.

William Le Baron Jenney was appointed as Architect and Chief Engineer for the entire West Park System in 1870. By the following year, he had developed plans for all three parks. Implementation did not occur in a comprehensive way. Rather, a large section of each park was improved, with the intent of full completion in the future. Jenney resigned from the West Park Commission in 1874. Oscar F. Dubuis, who had worked under Jenney, was appointed as Engineer to the System in 1877. He served in this capacity until 1892. He developed new plans which modified Jenney's work, but focused primarily on the sections of the park which had not yet been constructed.

By the late 1890s the West Park system had become crippled by political corruption. Though some construction took place, the parks suffered from a terrible lack of maintenance. Change finally came in 1905 when reform-minded Charles S. Deneen became Governor. After demanding the resignation of the entire Board of Commissioners, Deneen appointed a group of prominent businessmen and professionals to serve as the new Board (McCarthy, 1975.). Bernard A. Eckhart, a millionaire who was thought of as one of Chicago's most progressive citizens was elected as President of the Board. He asserted that the state of the park system was difficult to believe:

> ...the deplorable condition in which this system was found, -financially bankrupt, credit gone, boulevards impassable, sidewalks broken and out of grade, lawn spaces and park lawns exhausted, trees dead and dying, shrubbery destroyed, buildings all over the system tumbling down, scarcely any implements or tools available-nothing did we inherit at the time we assumed charge of the park system except an enormous pay roll and a vast number of unpaid bills aggregating over $180,000 (West Park Commission (WPC), Annual Report, 1907, pp. 36).

To provide leadership, design direction, and insure honest management , he hired Jens Jensen as Chief Landscape Architect and General Superintendent of the West Park System.

Jensen had worked for the previous Board from 1886 until 1900. He had risen from laborer to Superintendent of Humboldt Park, but had been fired in 1900 after repeatedly refusing to participate in political graft. Jensen was clearly "acutely aware of the district's long-overdue need for reform" (Ibid , pp. 169). In response to the terrible conditions of the three large West parks, Jensen developed extensive plans for redesigns. Most of these improvements took place between 1906 and 1914.

The last period in the West Park Commission's history in which significant construction took place was during the late 1920s. The nation's tremendous economic prosperity influenced a flurry of building activity in Humboldt, Garfield and Douglas Parks. In June of 1927, the West Park Commission received the approval of a $10,000,000 bond issue for a major improvement program. The majority of this funding was devoted towards the construction of a large, ornate building in each of the three parks. The firm of Michaelson and Rognstad was responsible for the design of all three buildings.

Lincoln Park Commission

The Lincoln Park Commission was created upon the adoption of the Lincoln Park Act. A five member Board of Commissioners with specific powers was designated. The Act also defined the existing boundaries of Lincoln Park and specified that additional lands could be acquired by purchase or condemnation. In addition, it provided for the condemnation of the cemetery and the removal of buried bodies, and established a system by which the Park Board could request bonds from the City of Chicago to purchase additional lands. The amendment which had been made to the Act to avoid the necessity of popular vote, limited the Lincoln Park Commission's taxing authority to an advisory role (Breen, pp. 133).

On July 1, 1871 the State Legislature enacted what was commonly referred to as the second Lincoln Park Act. It increased the Board of Commissioners from five to seven members and gave the Board the authority to issue bonds "to be redeemed by special assessments on all land within the towns benefited by the improvements" (Breen, pp.134).

Throughout its history, Lincoln Park was expanded through the acquisition of bordering lands and the creation of new landfill property. Each time the Lincoln Park Commission wanted to take any such actions, however, a new ordinance had to be passed. Therefore, there were numerous pieces of legislation tied to the growth and development of the park. The earliest legislation to enable the Commission to create landfill property was adopted in 1889. It allowed for the development of Lake Shore Drive as a boulevard on a strip of fill. In 1893, an act was approved which allowed the Commission to enlarge the Park through additional land acquisition.

Numerous boundary extensions continued through landfill projects. The first major acts to allow for these projects occurred in 1903. These acts were responsible for the extension of the northern boundary to Cornelia Avenue. That boundary was shifted northward in 1916, and again in 1925 when it was extended to Montrose Avenue. Prior to 1934, the boundary was extended to Foster Avenue. (Additional extensions took place after the consolidation of the Park Commissions in 1934).

Early Parks Transferred to the Park Commissions

Although the newly established park commissions dealt specifically with creating and managing parks, excluding Lincoln Park, the early parks tended to remain under the control of Chicago's Common Council. Among these were: Lakefront Park (which was also known as Lake Park and later became Grant Park), Union Park, Jefferson Park, Vernon Park, Wicker Park, Dearborn Park, Congress Park, Campbell Park, Ellis Park, and Washington Square. Several years after the Commissions became active, however, residents of neighborhoods surrounding some of these parks became dissatisfied with the way the properties were being managed.

In the early 1880s, criticism of the condition of Union Park led to discussions about the possibility of the West Park Commission taking over responsibility for the park. However, the original enabling legislation did not include any provisions for such land transfers. There was broad support in favor of giving Chicago's park commissions additional powers. On April 11, 1885 an Act was approved by the Illinois State Legislature which affected all three of the commissions. The Act authorized the commissions "to take, regulate, control and improve parks under the control of incorporated cities, villages or towns" (Breen, pp.423). The Act further

required consent from the city, town, or village authorities and the owners of properties abutting the park before the transfer could be made.

Only some of the early parks became Commission properties as a result of the 1885 legislation. Those that were transferred after the passage of the legislation included Union Park, and Lakefront Park. These properties were located in neighborhoods which developed strong park advocacy groups. Some of the other early parks were later transferred to the additional park districts (including Wicker Park and Vernon Park, see below); and others remained under the control of the City of Chicago.(Chicago City Manual, 1914, pp.9-10) (Of those which continued to be City property, some parks were eventually re-developed,and others were transferred to the Chicago Park District as part of a larger exchange with the City of Chicago in 1959.)

THE THREE ORIGINAL PARK COMMISSIONS' ABILITY TO CREATE ADDITIONAL PARKLANDS 1899-1934

The purpose of the 1885 legislation was to merely transfer land ownership. It did not create additional park lands. By the late 1890s a new wave of dissatisfaction with parkland in Chicago became prevalent. As was the case some thirty years earlier, fears related to poor health and sanitary conditions prompted efforts towards establishing additional parks. This time, however, the emphasis went much beyond the intention to change the physical environment. A new crusade to create more parks was one aspect of a national Progressive Reform Movement. Generated by members of the social elite, the movement focussed on the increasing problems associated with Chicago's tremendous industrial expansion. The reformers recognized the fact that the City's existing parks no longer served all of its citizens. The large pleasure grounds were located far away from the over crowded tenement districts which were in dire need for "breathing spaces." Associated with the effort to create open space in these neighborhoods, were social reform ideas about the use of structured active recreation to better the lives of under privileged children.

South Park Commission

Concerned with the poor living conditions in Brighton Park, a neighborhood near the Stock Yards, a group of prominent Chicagoans which included Philip Armour as well as three Senators, presented a petition to the South Park Commission in January of 1899 requesting that a new park be developed in that area. In order for the Commission to become empowered to create new parks, an additional Act was presented to the State Legislature. The new Act of State Legislature, which was approved on July 1, 1899, allowed for the creation of additional parkland for the first time in thirty years. It stated that park districts which represented a minimum of three towns could "buy land for park purposes if it was contiguous to an existing park or boulevard under control of a park board" (Ibid.). The Act stipulated that the regular tax levy would pay for the new land. The Brighton Park neighborhood thus became the site of the first park to develop as a result of the new legislation. The area's 34.88 acre property was transformed into an experimental neighborhood park, McKinley Park. It was eligible under the Act because it was located within the jurisdiction of the South Park Commission and contiguous with a boulevard, Western Avenue.

After the passage of the 1899 legislation, other efforts to bring parks into the neighborhoods came rapidly. In November of that year, the City of Chicago formed a Special

Parks Commission to study the needs and conditions of the densely populated central wards and recommend a plan for small parks and playgrounds. The Commission had originally intended to implement its recommendations through the auspices of the City, and it had begun to do so. It had successfully "established five parks in 1900, and assumed the costs of maintaining a sixth." (Three were located on city property, and three were located on property leased from prominent philanthropists) (McCarthy, pp. 163). In 1901, however, the Special Parks Commission's annual budget of $100,000 was decreased to a total of $11,500, and it was forced to redefine its role. While it attempted to continue creating additional parks and playgrounds on its minimal budget, the Commission decided to also work with the three park commission to achieve its ultimate goal. After dividing into two subcommittees:,the North side and South side divisions, the Special Parks Commission continued promoting the idea of small parks and playgrounds as a means to improve urban ills. This was accomplished through public relations and efforts to propose new legislation. It also began to work with the three park commissions to identify possible sites for new parks and playgrounds and to begin land acquisition.

On May 10, 1901 an Act was passed by the State Legislature which allowed the Park Commissions to create additional parks on lands which were not contiguous to existing parks or boulevards, but stipulated that the acquired properties could not exceed a maximum of ten acres in size. This Act did not eliminate the possibility of acquiring larger pieces of property for parks which were contiguous to other parklands. With the new legislation in place, the Commissions set out to begin programs for developing small parks. In 1902, the South Park Commission went to the State Legislature for approval to retire $600,000 in bonds for its small park system. The South Park Commission also brought the bond issue to referendum, though at the time, it was believed that this was not a required step. The Commission put the issue on referendum because it wanted to insure that there was popular support for the proposal. The issue was approved with a strong majority.

The South Park Commission took the lead in terms of developing plans and acquiring land for a new system of neighborhood parks. The Olmsted Brothers, landscape architects, and the D.H. Burnham Company, architectural firm, were retained to design fourteen small parks in 1903. While the planning and design process began, the Commission realized that the small parks legislation did not empower the Commissions to levy taxes for the maintenance of the new parks. Fearing the possible ramifications of this oversight, the Commission went to the State Legislature to amend the 1901 Act. Though the South Park Commission received criticism for slowing its process of new park development to focus on maintenance, the amendment passed in April of 1903 without complications. This legislation applied to the South Park Commission in a way that enabled it continuous neighborhood park development.

West Park Commission

The development of neighborhood parks within the West Park System did not proceed as smoothly as that of the South Park System. Though some of Chicago's west side districts were the poorest and most densely populated in the city, the West Park Commission was unable to establish any neighborhood parks until 1908. A number of problems related to political corruption, legal issues, and financial difficulties had caused this delay. The west side was deeply entrenched in machine politics, and the neighborhood parks offered little in the way of patronage jobs or construction contracts.

In 1902, the West Park Commission had made some effort to begin a neighborhood parks program by attempting to retire $1,000,000 in bonds. However, West side residents did not believe that this was an honest effort to establish new parks. At a mass meeting specifically held to oppose the bond issue:

> ...it was declared that a board that had permitted pay roll stuffing and had used the parks for years as a 'political asylum and nursery' was unfit to have 1,000,000 dollars or any other sum at its disposal (Chicago Tribune, Feb. 26, 1902).

The protestors made it clear that they were not against small parks and playgrounds, but simply did not trust the West Park Commission to honestly and properly establish them. The Commission did not bring the bond issue to referendum. After some controversy, it was determined that a Watch Dog citizens' committee would be established to monitor the Commission's progress.

The State Legislature approved the West Park Commission's bond issue, but the actual sale of the bonds did not take place. The Commission was unable to retire the bonds because there was a question about whether or not the 1901 enabling legislation was constitutional in its application to the West Park Commission. Due to this legal question, West Park Commission financial problems, and the increasing exposure of political graft, there was no progress in developing small parks throughout 1904. The Special Parks Commission was furious about the West Park Commission's failure to implement a small parks program. It was aware that the West Park System represented a huge and dense population of approximately 885,000 serviced by only two municipal playgrounds. In response, the Special Parks Commission published a brochure entitled A Plea for Playgrounds (1905). The brochure was widely distributed throughout Chicago. It solicited private funds to establish small parks and playgrounds in the West Park System. The fund drive raised an insubstantial sum of money. Though the Special Parks Commission brochure failed, the same year that the fund-raising effort was made, an honest and reform minded Board of Commissioners was appointed by the Governor. The new Board began making plans for neighborhood parks in earnest.

Inheriting the problems of its predecessor, it took a few years before new parks were established. The Board had, however, immediately begun efforts to resolve the question of the legality of the 1901 Act. The State Supreme Court decided that based on a technicality, the Act was in fact unconstitutional in its application to the West Park Commission. The Court also decided that the issuance of the bonds should have been approved by popular vote. Shortly thereafter, the Illinois Legislature approved a new Act to replace the legislation which was found unconstitutional. The new Act, which was approved on May 18, 1905 authorized Park Commissioners "to issue bonds to raise funds for the acquisition and improvement of small parks and pleasure grounds; and to provide a tax for the payment of the same" (Breen, pp.423). The Supreme Court ordered the $1,000,000 worth of bonds which had been issued in 1902 to be destroyed (W.P.C., Annual Report, 1905).

When the new West Park Board successfully floated a $1,000,000 bond issue for small parks in the fall of 1905, it seemed that the West side would finally see some progress. However, there were additional delays. Tremendous density in the west side districts made the acquisition of

property an arduous task. In some of the neighborhoods there were 74,000 people residing per square mile, 116 per acre (W.P.C., Annual Report, 1908, p. 38). The prospect of clearing land to establish parks thus posed the threat of displacement to large numbers of people. Many land owners fought to keep their property:

> The battle for the site of the first small park, an eight-acre tract of slum dwellings was typical. The owners asked $400,000 for the property, and the park board appealed to the Chicago Real Estate Board for an appraisal. The appraisal price was $161,000. Faced with condemnation proceedings, the owners accepted the offer of the West Park Board, but they promptly filed suit charging under evaluation. In 1908 the Illinois Supreme Court ruled in the owners' favor and ordered the board to pay an additional fee of almost $121,000 (McCarthy, pp. 169).

This lawsuit, some minor lawsuits, and the West Park's financial problems delayed the establishment of the first two West Park Commission small parks until the summer of 1908. A third neighborhood park opened in 1909.

Due to the great density of the West side neighborhoods, it was quickly recognized that additional playgrounds and parks were needed in the area. Careful data relating to the amount of use the first three new parks were receiving was collected. A combined total of more than two million people had used the facilities and services of the three parks in one year alone (W.P.C. Annual Report, 1911). The West Park Commissioners brought forth a bill to the State Legislature to allow for the creation of new parks. Approved on July 9, 1909, the bill was entitled "An Act to enable Park Commissioners to issue bonds to raise funds for the acquisition and improvement of additional small parks and pleasure grounds and to provide a tax for the payment of the same" (W.P.C., Annual Report, 1910). With the assistance of a Special Parks Commission detailed report, the West Park Commissioners selected additional park sites in 1911. These efforts led to the creation of five new neighborhood parks and a sixth which resulted from the redesign of an existing city park. All six were officially open by 1917. Jens Jensen was responsible for the landscape design, and William Carbys Zimmerman designed most of the architecture. Zimmerman received the commission through his appointment as State Architect by Governor Deneen.

The Commissioners were not only geared towards the development of small parks. They also wanted to create a park on what was then the "largest single piece of vacant property on the West side" (W.P.C., Annual Report, 1911). Thus, two more bills were brought to the State Legislature. The first, "An Act to enable Park Commissioners to enlarge park systems under their control by acquiring additional lands or territory for park purposes and to pay for the lands or territory thus acquired" which was approved on May 25, 1911 allowed for land acquisition. The second, an Act "To enable West Park Commissioners to issue bonds for the completion, improvement and maintenance of public lands, boulevards. and pleasure-ways under their control and to provide for the payment thereof" was to levy taxes for improvements. (Breen, pp. 418). This was approved on May 20, 1915, after several years of land acquisition. This project resulted in an opportunity for Jens Jensen to design a large park, Columbus Park, in the Prairie style.

Lincoln Park Commission

In 1908, the year in which the West Park Commission first established neighborhood parks, the Lincoln Park Commission also opened its first neighborhood parks. Like the West Park System, the Lincoln Park Commission had made earlier unsuccessful attempts to establish new parks. However, its difficulties were not related to political corruption. Its status as a quasi-City agency was a deterrent, and the Commissioners had been devoting most of their energies into expanding Lincoln Park. In 1903, the Special Park Commission had recommended sites for the development of small parks within the area, but the Lincoln Park system reported that it did not have the financial means to begin a program. When the capital was raised, there were protests by some area residents against playgrounds, in favor of open landscapes. Unswayed by these objections, the Lincoln Park Commission began developing its first playground and neighborhood park in 1907 which included the same program components as the other two Commissions.

For the design of these first two Lincoln Park Commission small parks, the socially conscious architect, Dwight H. Perkins was hired. By 1911, he had designed two more parks for tenement districts in the System. Within the jurisdiction of the Lincoln Park Commission, however, there were sections which were more affluent than these areas. Middle class residents in one such section began to lobby for their own park and in 1910 this effort resulted in the creation of Welles Park. Two other parks were developed in middle class neighborhoods between the mid 1920s and early 1930s.

Creation of New Parklands Along Chicago's South Lakefront

The creation of additional south lakefront parklands was historically tied to several debates and lawsuits relating to property ownership, particularly in regards to the area south of Randolph Street. The land between Randolph Street and 12th Street was given to the City by the Federal government in 1839, with the provision that the land was "public ground, forever to remain vacant of buildings." In 1844, the City reinforced this provision by passing their own resolution to keep this area as public ground. After the 1871 fire, the area between Randolph and 12th was being used as a public dump site. This prompted businessman A. Montgomery Ward to take the City to court on the basis of the 1839 restrictions. Ward contended that the owners of lots facing the lakefront had easements of light and air and an unobstructed view of the lake. The City administration challenged Ward's suit claiming that they were the sole owners of the property and could do as they pleased with the property. The Cook County Superior Court, however, upheld Ward's case and issued a permanent injunction against all structures within this area of the lakefront.

In 1869 ownership was given to the Illinois Central Railroad of the land east of Michigan Avenue along with contiguous submerged lands from 12th Street to 51st Street, for the sum of $800,000. It held title to this land until 1912, despite numerous civic efforts to reclaim the property for City use.

The South Park Commission began legislation in 1907 for a bill which would restore ownership of all of the lakefront between Grant Park and Jackson Park to the City and the State. It was unsuccessful, however, as a result of powerful lobbying in Springfield by the Railroad. In 1908, negotiations with the Railroad were resumed. Another agreement was reached in 1911, granting the South Park Commission riparian rights from 12th to 51st Streets, an additional strip of

land for the Field Museum, and the right to extend certain roads eastward over the IC's right of way. However, by this time the City had become interested in developing a commercial harbor along the lake from Randolph to 31st. The Harbor Commission reported in 1909 that "no park development should be favored which will forever prevent the possibility of utilizing a portion of this area later for harbor purposes."

The Burnham Plan of Chicago, which called for extensive park development along the lakefront, was introduced in 1909. By 1912 the plan had gained the favor of powerful real estate developers. In the same year, they supported a new ordinance which ceded the lakefront property to the South Park Commissioners, granting them riparian rights in order to proceed with the plans suggested by Burnham. In July, 1912 a bill was passed in which the IC agreed to relinquish some of their land, depress the train tracks, electrify their rail system, and surrender their rights to the submerged lands.

At this time, however, because of the city's interest in harbor development, the case was sent to the federal courts to gain the necessary approval for implementing improvement plans. These negotiations lasted eight years with a postponement during the war years, 1916-1919. The city council finally passed the ordinance on July 21, 1919, and it was accepted on January 12, 1920. Later that year the voters of Chicago agreed to issue the necessary bonds to allow the South Park Commission to proceed with its plans to create new park property through landfill along the lake from the Chicago River to 67th Street. This allowed for the creation of Burnham Park.

PARKS AND BOULEVARDS OF THE NINETEEN ADDITIONAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1895-1934

On June 24, 1895 an Act was approved by the State Legislature which allowed for the creation of new park districts in areas of Chicago which were not located within the jurisdiction of the South, West, and Lincoln Park Commissions. In order to establish a new park district residents of an unserved area were to petition the county judge. The Act established the park districts as independent municipalities with taxing powers with the ability to:

> ...acquire, lay out, establish, construct and maintain parks and boulevards in said district and provide boating basins in said parks, and have full power to control, manage and govern the said parks and boulevards and the use thereof. (Breen, pp. 4A).

In addition, the Act enabled the new park districts to take and fill in submerged lands bordering navigable bodies of water located within their jurisdiction. It stipulated that once submerged lands are taken for park purposes, they could never be granted or ceded away for any purpose. The Act also made specific provisions for maintenance of parks and parkways, and empowered the districts to employ police forces.

Though one of the major purposes of this legislation was to develop new parks in unserved areas, it was actually the desire to improve boulevards and parkways which prompted the creation of the first two park districts under the Act. The first, the Ridge Avenue Park District, was established in 1896. Located on the northern most border of Chicago, the nearby "...wide prairies

of Evanston served the needs of the meager population at the time" (Ibid, pp 222). The residents of the area petitioned the court to establish a park district for the purpose of improving and maintaining Ridge Avenue. In 1900, residents of an area east of the Ridge Avenue Park District and north of the Lincoln Park Commission established the North Shore Park District. Their intentions were to improve Sheridan Road, Pratt Avenue, and Ashland Avenue. In addition, they believed that the formation of the Park District would raise their property values as they had witnessed this with the neighboring Lincoln and Ridge Avenue Park Commissions.

As the idea of neighborhood parks was gaining popularity, residents of areas which were not served by the existing Commissions began pursuing means of establishing such parks in their neighborhoods. Many of these areas were more affluent than the tenement districts which the play movement had addressed. When one such community approached the Special Parks Commission to be included in small park plans, they quickly learned that the new parks would be located in areas that truly needed them because of overcrowding, and that "suburbanites" would have to wait (Chicago American, December 12, 1901). The formation of a small park district thus led to a means of creating neighborhood parks in these areas.

The success of the new parks in neighboring districts greatly influenced the formation of the seventeen park districts which came into existence after the Ridge and North Shore Park Districts. The creation of the Calumet Park District in 1903 was spurred by the great activity to begin establishing neighborhood parks in nearby areas of the South Park Commission. The next park commission to be formed was the Fernwood Park District in 1908. Though it had an existing park which had been established by the Village of Fernwood prior to annexation, this park district's creation was also influenced by the success of the South Park Commission. In fact, Fernwood area residents had wanted to become part of the neighboring South Park System, but resolved to establish a separate park district when they realized the legal complications suggested by their proposal (Breen, p. 55).

The residents of an area just west of the Fernwood Park District had similar enthusiasm for the park movement. They also formed a park district in 1908. This was the Ridge Park District. The movement continued to grow. In 1910 the Irving Park District was established. The residents of its areas wanted a permanent home for Fourth of July celebrations. Guidance to create this park district came from Alderman Beilfuss, who lived in the area and was well aware of the City's inability to establish parks in areas which were not overpopulated. After the township of Jefferson was annexed to Chicago, the Northwest Park District formed in 1911, and the Edison Park District in 1912. Also in that year the Old Portage Park District was created as a result of the efforts of an improvement club. In 1913, the residents of an area near those within the jurisdictions of the South Park System and the Calumet Park District were responsible for the formation of the West Pullman Park District.

The formation of a number of additional northwest side park districts continued as citizens in areas adjacent to the north branch of the Chicago River were increasingly concerned with commercial encroachment and impressed with the small parks movement. The Ravenswood Manor Park District was created in 1914. The Albany Park District and the River Park District were formed in 1917, followed by the Norwood Park District and the Jefferson Park District in 1920, the Hollywood Park District and Sauganash Park District in 1926, and the Edgebrook Park

District and Forest Glen Park District in 1929. In all, there were twenty two separate park commissions before 1934, when they were consolidated into the Chicago Park District.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE TWENTY-TWO SUPERSEDED PARK DISTRICTS 1934

Consolidation of the individual park systems became a point of debate shortly after the park systems themselves were established; in 1873 by Mayor Colvin, and in 1890 by the Citizen's Association. Discussion began in earnest in 1904, during an intense period of social and political reform which swept through Chicago. Consolidation was viewed as a method to stop corruption in the parks, and to create a more equitable use of tax revenues. It was felt that the selection of park commissioners should be transferred from the Governor to a local body, such as Judges of the Cook County courts, or the Mayor and Aldermen of Chicago. Neither of these seemed to be ideal solutions, however. The argument made was that this would simply transfer the parks from the clutches of the State political machine to the local machine. This 1904 recommendation, and a similar one proposed in 1906, both failed to win the support needed to pass into law.

The strongest push for consolidation occurred in 1912 as a result of a report prepared in 1911 by the Chicago Bureau of Public Efficiency entitled, "The Park Governments of Chicago: An Inquiry in to Their Organization & Methods of Administration." This Commission, chaired by philanthropist Julius Rosenwald, set forth the need for re-organization within the three large park systems to achieve greater efficiency and economic stability. The report gave detailed accounts of the poor management and corruption which were inherent in the current systems, and suggested two alternatives for change.

One recommendation was to simply re-organize the present system. The other proposal was much more drastic, and recommended consolidation of the park system with the City government. The Commission argued that there would be numerous benefits to be gained from consolidation. It was believed that consolidation would provoke a more equitable dispersal of tax dollars throughout the city, make possible large savings on operating costs, and place control of the parks under the citizens of Chicago rather than the State government. While the 1911 report failed to ignite the interest that it needed to pass, it nevertheless laid the groundwork for the consolidation that was eventually to come.

The Great Depression of the 1930s finally made the unification of Chicago's 22 park districts inevitable. All the districts were plagued by severe economic problems, resulting particularly from the decrease of property values and the subsequent decrease of the tax base. By 1933, the West Park Commission was more than $20,000,000 in debt. Although the South Park and Lincoln Park Boards were not so deeply in debt, they nevertheless encountered harsh criticism for waste in their banking and purchasing methods; the selling of bonds and developing large parks before they were needed (Marquette Park), and for their concession policies.

The bankrupt condition of the West Park Commission, the faltering state of the other districts, and the waste of maintaining duplicate personnel and machinery during times of extreme economic hardship were arguments for consolidation which could no longer be ignored. Thus, in 1933, 60 years after park consolidation was first proposed, the citizens of Chicago voted for unification of the 22 park districts, and in 1934 the Chicago Park District was formed. Although

consolidation did not solve all of the economic problems of the parks, by combining forces, the Chicago Park District was able to issue six million dollars of bonds to secure WPA assistance in the massive improvement programs undertaken throughout the Depression years. With the tremendous amount of work needed in the hundreds of existing parks, the Chicago Park District's WPA program did not create new parks. However, additional extensions to Lincoln Park were made during as part of this program.

F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type Urban Park

II. Description

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of Chicago's parks, expectations of the role in which public open space should serve, the way in which people used leisure time, politics, and styles and taste have influenced significant additions, alterations and redesigns. Thus, while the initial development of many of the city's urban parks relied upon comprehensive plans, the parks ultimately reflected layers of history. The property type of urban park has been developed for this nomination because it is recognized that the parks reflect a continuum of history, with numerous significant changes conducted by a variety designers in different styles. Previous works have divided parks into two groups: landscape parks and small parks. In terms of program, landscape parks were considered those oriented towards passive recreation, and small parks were considered those more oriented to

III. Significance

INTRODUCTION

Chicago's historic urban parks have a variety of kinds and levels of significance. Entire parks and elements of parks are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places because they meet with criterion A, criterion C, or both. The areas of significance covered in this form are: architecture, landscape architecture, social history,and entertainment/ recreation. In addition, there are numerous periods of significance.

CHICAGO'S EARLY PARKS 1839-1869

Soon after the city was incorporated in the 1830s, real estate developers began creating parks to enhance their own speculative residential ventures. They had intended to follow the

IV. Registration Requirements

EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Chicago's urban parks may have historic and/or design significance as some properties meet National Register of Historic Places criterion A, some meet with criterion C, and some meet both. Those which meet criterion A are eligible because they have significance related to recreation and/ or social history. Those which meet criterion C are eligible because they have architectural and/or landscape architectural significance.

Some properties have national significance, some have regional significance, and some have local significance. Those which have national significance include properties which have influenced the planning, design, programs, services, or events of parks, or elements of parks, throughout the nation. This scale of significance also includes properties which reflect nationally important movements in social history. This category also includes the work of master craftsmen, architects, landscape architects, artists, and planners whose work has been recognized on a national scale. An example of nationally important properties are the first system of additional parks established by the South Park Commission to bring "breathing spaces" into the neighborhoods (such as Sherman Park, Davis Square etc.).

[x] See continuation sheet

[X] See continuation sheet for additional property types

active recreation. However, it has been determined that this typology is invalid because passive elements were often included in small parks, and components associated with active recreation were incorporated into the large parks as they became fashionable.. In addition, there are no specific size or date requirements which can accurately divide Chicago's historic parks into two types. This nomination uses the terms pleasure grounds and neighborhood parks. While these terms help describe the parks, this is not a strict typology.

CHICAGO'S EARLY PARKS 1839-1869

The developers of Chicago's early parks (1839-1869) had intended for these public lands to be restful and attractive open spaces. They were to be modeled after private squares in London and New York. Those precedents were generally small Romantic gardens with heavy plantings and curving walks, or Victorian landscapes with geometric beds and straight paths. Such squares were often enclosed by ornamental iron fencing, and contained ornate fountains and benches.

In reality, however, the Chicago's speculative squares were often left unimproved and poorly maintained . They often "resembled nothing but vacant lots...fenced to prevent abuse by livestock and refuse dumpers" (Vinci and Christy, pp. 6). The treatment of the city's first known park, Dearborn Park (1839) unfortunately became the precedent. After initial plantings did not survive, the park remained barren until the land was redeveloped in 1872 for the purpose of a public library.

Though it was never redeveloped, Washington Square was treated in a similar manner. The deed of gift specified that the City was to fence and improve the property. However, little was done until 1869 when the City finally planted a few trees and constructed two diagonal concrete walks which crossed at the center. At that time, a simple board fence was also constructed. After a number of years additional improvements were made. A 1914 description indicated that:

> There are a hundred more or fewer trees in fairly good condition. Concrete walks lead through from corner to corner, crossing each other at the center of the grounds, where is a fountain standing in a basin made of concrete. Benches placed along the walks invite occupancy. The Lincoln Park Commission, which has jurisdiction there [possession taken in 1869], have forgotten Mr. Bushnell's stipulation for a fence; instead there is stone coping around the grounds (Chicago City Manual, 1914).

Though the construction of these amenities did not occur until many years after the creation of Washington Square, the implemented design represents the appearance which had been intended for the early parks.

Union Park (1854) was another early park which remained unimproved for many years, but finally resulted in a stylized landscape. It was one of the largest of the early parks in Chicago. The land remained generally unimproved until the end of the Civil War. At that time, the City invested $50,000 in Victorian picturesque improvements:

> Walks and drives were laid out. In the exact center there was placed a pond in the shape of three partly formed circles, spanned with decorative iron bridges. At the north end, one of these, a rustic bridge led out from the shore to a diminutive island in the middle of the water. Swans and ducks floating gracefully over its surface lent much to the beauty of the little artificial lake. In the south section of the park the rustic-constructed Grant Observatory was erected, affording at its apex a beautiful view of the whole park area as well as of a large portion of the City. In landscaping, the plan of studding beautiful grass plots with trees, fountains, rustic seats and arbors, was followed. An innovation of the time was the introduction of a small collection of animals caged in the park. In addition to these there were eagles, owls and other wild birds. (Breen, pp. 571)

Lincoln Park was also similar. The City landscape gardener, John C. Ure, made the first improvements in the mid- 1860s. By 1868, under the direction of the landscape gardener Swain Nelson, Lincoln Park began to take shape as one of the cities first large pleasure grounds. A few small lakes were excavated, areas were planted and drives were developed. In that year, it also began to develop a zoo. However, it was not until the Lincoln Park Commission was formed, that the development of the park took on a uniform direction.

THE CREATION OF THE THREE ORIGINAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1869-1934

In 1869, legislation was passed forming the South, West and Lincoln Park Commissions. The three park districts were charged with the task of developing parks for the city. Between the South and West Park Commissions there were to be four new parks built ringing the city, totaling approximately 1500 acres. Lincoln Park, on the north side, originally consisted of 60 improved acres with the 20 acre cemetery to the south.

The landscape parks developed by the three commissions all had similar landscape features primarily falling into four categories: open grounds, forested perimeters, brambles and promenades. The open grounds were generally the heart of the activities of the parks. They were large meadows which were surrounded by a scalloped edge of trees. During the early years of the parks, they were primarily used for parades and other events involving large numbers of people. However, most of the time they remained as quiet open areas used to develop expansive views. As parks became more oriented toward active recreation, the meadows often were developed with ball fields.

The forested perimeters of the parks originally had the primary task of buffering the pastoral landscape of the parks from the noise and density of the city. Over the years these perimeter areas were the site of many of the built additions to the parks, often compromising the effectiveness as buffer zones. Increasing recreation requirements brought swimming pools, indoor and outdoor roque courts, a game similar to croquet, tennis courts and other organized game facilities to these areas.

Brambles, areas of very densely planted trees and understories with narrow winding paths, offered intimately scaled areas for quiet contemplation. These areas changed little until concern for

safety in the last half of this century required the removal of the understory. However, the tightly planted trees often still exist.

The promenades which were designed for the landscape parks were often a formal axial path planted to either side with regularly spaced trees, often American Elms. The promenades, when developed, also went through little change as recreational trends shifted. However, often the mono-culture plantings of trees, particularly the American Elms succumbed to disease. With these four basic components the landscape architects of the South, West, and Lincoln Park Commissions designed the first large landscape parks in Chicago.

South Park Commission

The landscape design firm, Olmsted and Vaux, was hired by Chicago's South Park Commission in 1869 to design South Park (now Jackson Park,Washington Park and the Midway Plaisance). The plan for this system of just over 1000 acres was published in 1871. Washington Park was smaller and was built on higher and drier ground than Jackson Park. It had as its centerpiece a large open meadow named the South Open Green. In Jackson Park, adjacent to Lake Michigan, Olmsted planned to turn swampland into a reserve of lagoons, islands and glades. The Midway, a wide straight boulevard, extended for five long blocks between the two parks. Olmsted called for a system of waterways beginning at Lake Michigan, winding through the lagoons of Jackson Park, connecting with a formal basin in the Midway, and then culminating in a small lagoon in Washington Park. This was intended as a waterway on which boats could travel on Lake Michigan from the city center, approximately seven miles north of Jackson Park, and enter the system of lagoons and travel through most of South Park. This ambitious Olmsted plan was modified in 1872 when the South Park Commission hired H.W.S. Cleveland to oversee the construction of the parks. The Commission had told him "to change the design to avoid 'extensive alterations to the natural surface" (Ranney, 1972, pp. 32).

Though modifications were required of him, Cleveland remained loyal to Olmsted's plan in his development of Washington Park. Around the perimeter of the park was a boundary of trees. Winding through this were driving and walking paths . Hidden within the border trees were stable and shops. An important design objective was that any buildings required on the park grounds were not to impact upon the contemplative nature of the landscape. The majority of the north section of the park was occupied by a large meadow covering 100 of the 372 acres of the park. The southern portion of the park was developed with a small lagoon, named the Mere. The southern section also contained the few formal elements of the parks. These included the Mall, a formal promenade extending for 1/3 mile at the edge of the Mere, and the Concourse, a paved open area, at the edge of the Meadow where carriages and people could congregate. All of these elements were called for in Olmsted's plan, and none were omitted.

The development of Jackson Park did not proceed at the same pace as Washington Park. The plan for Jackson Park was modified twice before 1900, first by Olmsted, and later his sons. In 1890, when a site for the Columbian Exhibition was being sought, Jackson Park was selected. The result of Olmsted's design for the Fair was the transformation of the swampy ground into a Monumental City, with a magnificent bi-axial canal. Surrounding this Court of Honor were Beaux Arts style buildings designed by a number of leading architects from around the nation. The design of the White City's plaster structures was guided by Daniel H. Burnham.

When the Fair closed, the firm of Olmsted, Olmsted and Eliot was charged with the task of once again redesigning Jackson Park. The firm's plan of 1896 returned Jackson Park to its intended, pastoral state. The most significant element maintained from the Fair was the Palace of Fine Arts, (now the Museum of Science and Industry) designed by Charles Atwood at the north end of the park.

Other significant changes to the original design were the greater open space developed as a golf course, and the elimination of the concourse. Similar to Olmsted's original design was the large expanse of lagoon, occupying the center of the park. In the lagoon was a large island developed on the north end with a Japanese Pavilion remaining from the fair, and a rose garden at the southern end.

Buildings were constructed in both Washington and Jackson Parks at fairly regular intervals between 1869 and 1934. The original buildings were diverse in their styles. William LeBaron Jenney's boat house in Washington Park was designed to emulate a Greek temple, while the stable building was a powerful, rusticated structure. The buildings of the early 20th century followed the precedent set by the Columbian Exposition. The Washington Park Refectory and the new South Park Administration building, both designed by D.H. Burnham and Company, had classical Beaux Arts details. However, one was constructed of brick, and the other was pop-corn concrete (also known as "marblecrete" and described in further detail below). The 64th Street Bathing Pavilion, designed by the staff of the South Park Commission, was derived from the earlier D.H. Burnham and Company work for the South Park Commission.

West Park Commission

The West Chicago Park Commission hired William LeBaron Jenney to design the three parks of the the West Park System. The pleasure grounds designed by Jenney totaled approximately 585 acres, about half that of South Park. The parkland was split between three parks of approximately the same size bordering the west side of the city. To the south was Douglas Park, the smallest at 180 acres. The furthest north was Humboldt Park, which was the largest at 193 acres. Between them was Central Park, which was 185 acres in size (In 1887 this park was renamed in honor of the assassinated President Garfield). The three parks were connected by boulevards which made a line of green space over eight miles in length.

The parks were similar to those designed by Olmsted for the South Park Commission. Jenney's landscapes, while greatly influenced by Olmsted's work, were significantly linked to the Romantic tradition. Jenney had become familiar with the Romantic designs of the grand parks of Paris. Yet, Jenney is best known as an engineer, and the design of his parks were greatly influenced by that training. His work was influenced by practical aspects such as soil permeability and run-off. Therefore, Jenney had intended for much larger lagoons than either Olmsted's or those of the French parks.

Jenney's parks were more architectural in their composition than Olmsted's. Landscape historian, Reuben Rainey attributes this to his perceived need to suppress the harsh prairie, and facilitate the multiple functional requirements which had to be addressed in these parks of less than 200 acres. He explains:

> Jenney envisioned each park of his system as having individual character, yet a similar treatment of water, structures, and planting would produce a unified ensemble which would be "harmonious, consistent and complete." The three center pieces, Douglas, Humboldt and Central Parks, are subtle variations on a theme. All three pivot around central lakes and are planted very much alike. Building materials are also similar. Douglas Park provides more opportunity to become absorbed in the lushly planted landscape through a series of lakeside promenades which unfold an ever changing series of views, mostly directed across the lake. Humboldt Park is dominated by an elegant esplanade terminating in a terrace thrust forward into the central lake. This highly architectonic peninsula lends an air of urbanity to the park, which pivots around its ornate set piece like an English park enframing a stately country house. Central Park is the richest in program and facilities. (Reuben Rainey, "A Prairie Metamorphosis: William Le Baron Jenney's Vision of Chicago's Central Park." In Print, Threshold, University of Illinois Press.)

Thus, while Olmsted generally intended to emphasize natural features, Jenney's landscapes were often backdrops for built features.

Similar to the South Parks, though Jenney's plans were approved. However, they were never fully implemented. O. F. Dubuis, who was appointed as engineer in 1877 was responsible for alterations to all three original Jenney plans. As he had previously worked for Jenney, Dubuis' modifications to Jenney's work were moderate. They mainly consisted of reducing the number of built elements in the parks, often eliminating the formal esplanades and other hard landscape features. In addition, Dubuis tended to concentrate on designing the unimplemented areas of Jenney's plans.

The architecture of the nineteenth century in the three West Parks was eclectic in its variety and design. Jenney designed a number of the original buildings for the three parks. They were often rustic or exotic in style. The Stable Building at Garfield Park was constructed out of pressed brick and was reminiscent of a medieval European stable. His Pagoda (now demolished), which disguised a water tower, was one of the more exotic buildings in the park. Other architects contributed in similar ways to the landscape. Examples included Froman and Jebsen's picturesque stable building for Humboldt Park and J.L. Silsbee's Byzantine bandstand for Garfield Park.

In 1905, Jens Jensen was hired as the General Superintendent of the West Chicago Park Commission. Due to the dilapidated state of the "pleasure grounds" at the turn of the century, Jensen began a massive program of redesigning the parks. In all three parks, Jensen reduced the size of the lagoons by a substantial degree and replaced them with prairie meadows. He was also influential in the development of Prairie style buildings and site furnishings in the three parks.

Within the context of the rehabilitated landscapes Jensen influenced the commission of Prairie School architects to design the buildings. As examples, Hugh Garden's Boathouse and Refectory at Humboldt Park represents the aesthetic of these buildings in the three parks. The building had three large arches spanning the porch which link two end pavilions. The entire structure was covered by a hipped roof with broad overhangs.

Though the parks went through major improvements in the 1900s, by the 1920s they again fell into disrepair. In 1928, a massive rehabilitation program was undertaken. Into the prairie influenced landscapes of Jensen, a series of Revival style fieldhouses were introduced. The plans of the Douglas and Humboldt Park fieldhouses were identical, yet the exterior treatments reflected different historic influences. At Douglas Park the building was Georgian Revival style, and at Humboldt it was Tudor Revival. At Garfield Park the West Park Commission constructed a new headquarters. This was a lavish Spanish Baroque Revival style building capped by a gold dome.

Lincoln Park Commission

After the Lincoln Park Commission was established in 1869, the park continued to develop in a patchwork fashion. The Commission began with the original "Lake Park" site infested with poison ivy, a cemetery, and a ravaged shore line. Between 1869 and 1881 the area bounded by North Avenue and Fullerton was developed. Hundreds of trees were planted and lavish expenditures were made on shrubs. The result was a rolling picturesque landscape of glens separated by lanes and forested boundaries. During this period, the south lagoon was excavated from a natural swale. In 1881, the development of Lincoln Park continued north of Fullerton where a second lagoon was developed and the landscape design continued in the same style.

Throughout the remainder of the 19th century and into the 20th century, the work of a variety of designers, including Carl Strombach and Ossian Simmonds, left a highly manipulated landscape. Vinci and Christy described it as several small efforts that add up to a consistent composition with great variety and textures (1982). The portion of the Park between North and Diversey has a high concentration of buildings. As with the landscape many designers were responsible for developing the buildings over the years. The multitude of styles that are represented in the Park are dominated by the Picturesque, Beaux Arts Classical and Prairie buildings. The conservatory, designed by J.L. Silsbee, with its multiple roofs and rusticated water table is one of the park's remaining examples of the Picturesque architecture that dominated during the nineteenth century. The Academy of Science, designed by Patton and Fisher is one of the most sophisticated Beaux Arts Classical building in Lincoln Park. This style of architecture predominated until consolidation. However, Dwight H. Perkins designed Cafe Brauer in the Prairie style.

The character of Lincoln Park changed dramatically in the area developed north of Diversey after 1925. Constructed on entirely reclaimed land from the lake, the new park area was devoted primarily to active recreational uses. The resulting landscape is dominated by open expanses of playfields, beaches, and a golf course.

THE ORIGINAL THREE PARK COMMISSIONS' ABILITY TO CREATE ADDITIONAL PARKLANDS 1899-1934

The development of the neighborhood parks in Chicago led to a group of parks of much smaller scale, and a different recreational emphasis than the commissions' earlier parks. They ranged between 2 and 100 acres. The landscapes for these parks generally had a different goal than those of the original large parks. These smaller parks were designed to primarily facilitate active recreation. The resulting landscapes included areas for outdoor gymnastics for both sexes.

children's play running, and baseball. Over the years other facilities have been added to this basic structure including tennis courts and handball courts.

At the heart of the small parks was a new institutional building type -- the "fieldhouse." As this building type had never existed before, there were no specific stylistic models for the designers to follow. The result was that the configuration and the overall architectural appearance of the fieldhouse complexes varied from between the commissions, but the program elements were similar. The fieldhouses contained assembly halls and club rooms, indoor gymnasiums, and locker rooms. They often had branch libraries and lunchrooms, and in most cases, there was an outdoor swimming tank either as part of the building complex, or located with shower rooms in another section of the park.

South Park Commission

Within the South Park Commission where most of the design innovation took place, the small parks, despite the variations in the size all had similar functions. The resulting designs, particularly those of the squares, were much like the sketch for a generic "ten acre playground" which had been quickly drawn by John Olmsted on the back of hotel stationary and dated December 3, 1903.

All the activities were zoned. The facilities that required supervision were most often clustered along one edge of the park. These included the fieldhouse, men's and women's outdoor gymnasiums, running tracks and the children playground. The rest of the landscape was devoted to ball fields and walking paths. In the center of each small park was a large field specifically reserved for ball games. Encircling each square and park was a walking path, or promenade, carefully shaded by trees, with small areas of lawn disposed along them. In general the placement of the individual program elements was entirely axial and formal. The grid of the street was echoed in the square and the activity zones were regulated by the fieldhouse. Design devices were used in an attempt to create pastoral views across the landscape of the smallest parks, under ten acres. The fieldhouse became the object of focus, and the ball field acted as the open expanse to view the distant focal point over.

Though the Olmsteds had developed and basically followed a prototypical plan, they had no intention of creating identical parks. In fact, they stressed that in spite of similarities in the characteristics of sites and program requirements, each design should be unique. The properties which were to become squares were particularly alike. Three of them were within 0.33 acres of being identical in size, and all of them were between five and nine acres. Only one of them varied from the rectangular order pre-ordained by the Chicago grid. The solution was often to allow natural characteristics of the site generate the difference in a design. Where the land was lower than the surrounding streets, the play fields could be depressed. If the surrounding streets were not highly traveled, the play field could be left without walls or fencing. If the neighborhood pedestrian traffic warranted, there could be diagonal paths across the field. Quite often, a disadvantage in the site would be used to the advantage of a design. Walls could be built along railroad embankments for games which used them, such as baseball or handball. Finally, on the few sites where the ground was higher than the surrounding streets, the Olmsteds suggested

centering the buildings to make them "more commodious and more symmetrical and dignified in architecture" (Olmsted Brothers to Henry Foreman, Library of Congress).

Inspired by the Columbian Exposition, the buildings of the South Park Commission's neighborhood parks were usually complexes of several structures. The fieldhouse was the dominant feature. It contained the assembly and club rooms, the lunch room, and the library (when there was one). Behind the fieldhouse, or to either side, were the gymnasium buildings which were often attached by pergolas. The swimming tank tended to be located in the precinct between the fieldhouse and gymnasium. These structures formed an outdoor room around the swimming pool, emulating the Court of Honor at the Columbian Exposition.

The architectural details were also inspired by the World's Fair. Here, however, even a greater adaption was required. The building material for all of the new structures was a form of reinforced concrete which has become known as "popcorn concrete" or "marblecrete." Henry Foreman, President of the SPC wrote favorably in regards to the building material in a 1905 article. He stated that: "In the surface finish small particles of stone are visible, making the wall rough instead of flat and meaningless" (Century Magazine, 1905, p. 613). It was an inexpensive material from which buildings could be constructed rapidly. Though the ornamentation was based on classical models, the detailing was molded into the concrete, and the rough-cast character required that details be rendered in a simplified vocabulary, devoid of intricacies.

The Olmsteds remained involved in the design of the neighborhood parks longer than D.H. Burnham and Company. However, the work of both the Olmsteds and D.H. Burnham and Company continued to influence the design of the neighborhood parks in South Park Commission even after both companies had ceased direct involvement. In 1911 the Olmsteds designed a second generation of neighborhood parks for the South Park Commission. Two of the parks had nearly identical designs: Grand Crossing and Trumbull Parks. The very formal design placed the fieldhouse near the center of the site overlooking a concert grove and promenade bordered by Ginko trees. The fieldhouses at Grand Crossing and Trumbull Parks were designed by the staff of the South Park Commission. As with the landscapes they were nearly identical in design. They were constructed out of marblecrete and classically detailed. The relation to Burnham's work is clear yet the planning of the buildings is not as sophisticated. Later neighborhood parks in the South Park Commission were designed entirely in-house. Yet the lessons of the Olmsteds and Burnham continued to influence the designs.

West Park Commission

The West Park Commission developed neighborhood parks within their district after the program in the South Parks had been well established. Due to budget limitations and the difficulties of land acquisition in such a densely populated area, the West Park Commission neighborhood park sites ranged from only 1.94 acres to 8.26 acres in size. In spite of the small size of the West Park Commission neighborhood parks, Jensen's solution to the space conflicts was not the rigid zoning techniques used by the Olmsted Brothers.

Jensen's overall approach was a loose organization of space, with activities integrated throughout. Generally the men's and women's gymnasiums flanked the fieldhouse. However, unlike the South Park Commission's neighborhood parks, the children's playground was

separated from the women's gymnasium, and the swimming pool occupied a separate precinct of the park, and generally the children's gardens were also cultivated in this precinct. Despite the loose organization of the activities, the introduction of prairie elements into his early neighborhood parks was not highly developed. Beyond the playfield and promenade he was often able to develop naturalistic pockets of lawn surrounded by densely planted shrubs and trees. However, the overall design of the parks were nearly symmetrical, and the plans for the promenades encompassing the ball fields were geometric.

Yet as Jensen's design abilities developed through the years he eventually created a neighborhood park that incorporated many of the important elements associated with Prairie style landscapes. In his plan for Franklin Park, Jensen used native plant materials, sun openings as playfields, winding paths, and irregularly shaped pools like natural swimming holes. Finally, between 1916 and 1919, Jensen had the opportunity to create a whole new park which fully expressed his Prairie style. This was the 135 acre Columbus Park. Its design included a players hill, waterfalls edged with stratified stonework, a miniature prairie river, and his design signature, the council ring.

As Jensen had vigorously campaigned for Prairie style buildings in his redesign of the "pleasure grounds," he also was influential in having the fieldhouses in the neighborhood parks designed in the same manner. The West Park Commissions first fieldhouses were designed by William Carbys Zimmerman. Most were constructed of brown brick. They had slate or tile roofs with broad overhangs, long symmetrical facades, and bands of windows which emphasized the buildings' horizontally. The design of the West Park Commission neighborhood park fieldhouses placed a great deal of emphasis on social spaces, with many porches, verandas and sitting areas. Unlike the building complexes of the South Park Commission, the various components of the West Park fieldhouse were configured in a single structure.

During the massive rehabilitation of the parks of the West Park District which began in 1927, several neighborhood parks were improved. The firm of Michaelsen and Rognstad designed Revival style fieldhouses for those parks which did not have such facilities. These buildings ranged from the lavish to the mundane. The fieldhouse at LaFollette Park was finished in marbles and fine plaster work, and included an indoor pool and large theater, while the fieldhouse at Harrison Park was nothing more than a utilitarian Georgian Revival building housing gymnasiums and locker rooms.

Lincoln Park Commission

The Lincoln Park Commission began to develop small parks in its tenement districts in 1907. Dwight H. Perkins was responsible for the architecture and the landscapes of three Lincoln Park Commission neighborhood parks and one playground. Most of the emphasis was placed on the design of the buildings. The fieldhouses were single buildings containing gymnasiums, club rooms, and assembly halls. They were Prairie style structures, constructed of brick. The landscapes included the components which had been incorporated into the parks of the other two Commissions. However, they did not have the strict zoning of activities which the Olmsteds used, or Jensen's Prairie landscape elements.

In the more affluent communities within the Lincoln Park District the design of neighborhood parks deviated from the pattern set by those developed in the poorer neighborhoods of all three districts. Welles Park, was an example of such a neighborhood park in a more affluent area within the Lincoln Park Commission's jurisdiction . As stated in the Report of the Commissioners of Lincoln Park 1913-1916 "the greater portion of the area" of Welles Park was devoted to "a picturesque grass meadow" as opposed to the program components of the other neighborhood parks. The buildings associated with the parks in the more affluent neighborhoods also deviated from the fieldhouse type established in the poorer neighborhoods. At Welles Park the building (now demolished) was a single large assembly room used for dances and meetings.

Creation of New Parklands Along Chicago's South Lakefront

During the period of small park expansion the lakefront parks also expanded on land reclaimed from the lake. Grant Park developed beyond the Illinois Central tracks. This portion of the park was divided into three formal sections. The centerpiece was the Buckingham Fountain which was raised above the level of the rest of the park. To the north and south of the fountain table were two large fields for active recreation. The architectural elements of the fountain table were monumental in scale and derived from classical elements. However, four sculptural elements on a diagonal axis with the fountain represent a more streamlined aesthetic. Flower gardens and numerous other pieces of sculpture have been added in the Park over the years. Most have remained in consistent with Grant Park's formality. This formality was continued into the southern end of the park with the Field Museum and the Shedd Aquarium, both designed in the Beaux Arts Classical style.

Burnham Park, by virtue of its function as a connecting open space between Grant Park and Jackson Park, was linear in design. It had two primary nodes: the Northerly Island extension on the north and the 55th Street Promontory on the south . (The Promontory is discussed below under the section on post-consolidation designs). The Northerly Island was a peninsular extension of 12th Street into the Lake. This linear area provided a formal approach to the Adler Planetarium, sited at its most easterly end.

Soldier Field was placed at the north side of Burnham Park, directly across from the Field Museum at the southern edge of Grant Park. The architectural treatment of Soldier Field complimented the various formal and classical elements of Grant Park. The structure was composed of two large Doric colonnades. Originally, the structure formed a V, with the open end facing the southern facade of the Field Museum. Between Soldier Field and the southern end of Burnham Park a stretch of landscape was developed at incremental stages of landfill. The treatment has generally been one of a rolling landscape with various form of vegetation, including one of the few uses of evergreens in any of Chicago's urban parks.

PARKS AND BOULEVARDS OF NINETEEN ADDITIONAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1895-1934

In middle class communities on the north and northwest sides the landscapes tended to either be those which offered strictly utilitarian, athletic spaces, or those which took advantage of the natural advantages of the site. Two examples of this diversity are Athletic Field and Gompers

Parks. Athletic Field , which was in the Irving Park District, was designed specifically for encouraging athletics. The flat 3.56 acre site was laid out with facilities for tennis, baseball, ice skating, wading pools, horseshoes, football, soccer and archery. Gompers, originally of the of the Albany Park District, is situated on the north branch of the Chicago River. Within the boundaries of the park are an unchannelized portion of the river, floodplains and steeply sloping river terraces, forested by Burr and White Oak.

Exceptions occurred throughout the park districts. While many Park Districts were only able to include minimal improvements, there were exceptions. Independence and Portage Parks are two examples of middle class neighborhood parks with full scale landscape designs. While these parks offered a full range of recreational activities, they also devoted space and money to creating formal gardens with gravel paths, fountains and elaborate floral displays.

The fieldhouses that were constructed in the 19 additional park districts reflect the architectural trends of the late 1920s. The eclectic Revival styles that were dominating suburban growth were used in the parks. The work of Clarence Hatzfeld, who designed in several different Revival styles, is representative of the work of all of the architects designing for these small districts. Most of his work can be considered Tudoresque (Vinci and Christy, 1982.). The fieldhouse at Eugene Field Park with its two half-timbered gables, casement windows and balcony supported by wooden brackets suggest buildings of Elizabethan England. However, he also designed fieldhouses in Spanish Baroque and Georgian Revival styles. The companion fieldhouse to the outdoor athletic facilities at Athletic Field Park was an example of the former. The two story brick building had a round arch arcade flanked by two projecting pavilions. The round headed windows in the pavilions were separated by twisted columns. The building was covered with a Spanish tile roof. The brick Georgian Revival fieldhouse at Kilbourn Park has a projecting classical limestone porch, limestone quoins and limestone keystones in each window arch. The building is covered with a relatively flat hipped roof. Among the 19 additional park districts there was very little new design innovation. Rather, the emphasis was directed toward developing community parks which assimilated into the middle class residential neighborhoods.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE TWENTY TWO SUPERSEDED PARK DISTRICTS IN 1934

The consolidation of the twenty two superseded park districts in 1934 brought to the areas which had underfunded park services facilities similar to those which had been developed by the more wealthy commissions. The improvements made in neighborhood parks which had never been completed by the small park districts were often direct replicas of those pioneered by the South Park Commission, such as spray pools and pergolas. Playgrounds and facilities for active recreation were emphasized in these Chicago Park District improvement projects. Tennis courts were particularly popular. In addition, comfort stations (buildings which offered bathroom facilities) were constructed in all of the large regional parks during this period. These buildings were often constructed in brick, and designed in Revival styles.

Among the positive results of the post consolidation were the many landscape designs of Alfred Caldwell. An intimately scaled project was the lily pond at Lincoln Park. Richard Guy Wilson, Architectural Historian, described the work as follows:

> Around the remains of an old canal Caldwell constructed an enclave that continued his theme of man renewed by nature. Ledges of built-up limestone outcroppings enclose and define the central space of the pool and suggest a prairie river landscape. The boundary is planted as a forest with native trees, shrubs, ferns and wild flowers Grasses and lilies grow in the pool. From varying heights, a stone path leads the observer around the expansive and seemingly natural enclave ("Alfred Caldwell Illuminates Nature's Ways," Landscape Architecture, September 1977).

A larger scale project of Caldwell's was Promontory Point at Burnham Park. The Point was a landfill extension into the lake. It was protected by a breakwater constructed of huge stone slabs. Massive plantings of native plant material defined large areas for softball and smaller areas embracing council rings.

Coinciding with the landscape work at Promontory Point, there was an in-house designed fieldhouse. This was a lannon stone structure with a slate roof by E.V. Buchsbaum. The Chicago Park District architectural designer was also responsible for the North Avenue Beach House. The building is an architectural folly. It is a streamlined version of a lake ship.

tradition of: the Duke of Bedford's developments, Covent Garden and Bloomsbury Square (1661) in London; as well as Gramercy Park (1831), developed by Samuel Ruggles, and Stuyvesant Square (1837) in New York City (White, 1987). In reality, the small parks and squares were often left unimproved.

Though they were often no more than small plots of untended land, these early parks provided guaranteed open space to the residents who lived in the surrounding fashionable housing. In addition, they proved to be important community places for all of the city's residents. When the area adjacent to Washington Square became a lively lower class neighborhood around the turn of the century, wealthy residents of nearby areas began to frequent the Square. The park became known as "Bughouse Square" and popular as a forum for free speech.

In 1849, John S. Wight, a Chicago real estate speculator had imagined a grand scheme in which park development would have a beneficial impact on the entire city. He wrote:

> I foresee a time, not very distant, when Chicago will need for its fast increasing population a park or parks in each division. Of these parks I have a vision. They are improved and connected with a wide avenue, extending to and along the lake shore on the north and south, and surrounding the city with a magnificent chain of parks and parkways that have not their equal in the world (Chicago City Manual, 1914, pp. 7).

As there were few public policies relating to open space, Wight's vision did not have an immediate impact. Thus, parks continued to develop in a haphazard, site-by-site basis which often resulted in little more that empty lots.

By the 1850s growing concern about health and sanitary conditions in Chicago led citizens to advocating park development to organize. There was particular concern about the public health threat posed by the "Chicago Cemetery" which was located on the north side lakefront. Due to the water level of Lake Michigan, the graves were quite shallow, and in them victims of cholera and smallpox were buried. Dr. John Rauch, of the Chicago branch of the national Sanitary Commission began leading a protest against further growth of the cemetery (Ranney, 1972, pp. 15). This effort led to the creation of Lake Park, which later became one section of Lincoln Park.

THE CREATION OF THE THREE ORIGINAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1869-1934

By the 1860s, there was a growing movement which advocated a comprehensive system of parks throughout Chicago. In 1868, the Chicago Academy of Sciences requested that Dr. Rauch prepare a study on the health benefits of parks. The following year he published a report entitled Public Parks: Their Effects upon the Moral, Physical, and Sanitary Condition of the Inhabitants of Large Cities; with Special Reference to the City of Chicago. In addition to Dr. Rauch's efforts on the city's North side, two other groups of citizens from the South and West sides had been lobbying the State Legislature to become empowered to create public parks. In 1869, three Acts of State Legislature were approved, which established the Lincoln, South, and West Park Commissions. The legislation mandated the boundaries which could be expanded to enlarge

Lincoln Park, and the specific lands for parks and boulevards to be established by the South and West Park Commissions.

When the three Commissions were first established, a coordinated effort to develop a system of boulevards linking south, west, and Lincoln parks was being considered. Dr. John Rauch wrote that "he was preparing the way" to have the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, conduct a study to lead to the design of a whole system of parks and boulevards in Chicago (Ranney, 1972, pp. 16). This did not materialize because of the political structure of the three separate commissions. Rather, planning for the new parks and boulevards happened on a separate basis.

Though Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903) and his partner, Calvert Vaux (1824-1895), were only hired by the South Park Commission they clearly influenced the design of public parks nationwide. Olmsted, who is now considered the father of American landscape architecture, was responsible for the planning and design of regions, cities, suburban communities, urban parks, parkways, and campuses throughout the United States and Canada. In addition, he was greatly committed to social democracy, and his work became an important vehicle in the Conservative Social Reform Movement of the mid-nineteenth century.

Olmsted did not establish his career in landscape architecture until he was nearly forty years old. As the son of a well-to-do Connecticut merchant, he had traveled extensively and dabbled in several vocations during his earlier life. Among other positions, Olmsted had been a book keeper, a scientific farmer, a surveyor, and a journalist. His writings were oriented towards social criticism and theory. As a practical man who realized that industrial cities were a permanent fixture on the American landscape he was not interested in developing utopian societies. Rather, he was concerned with releasing urban tensions through park design and development. He thought that the public park could counteract defensive interaction between the classes by what he defined as "receptive" forms of relaxation. His intention was a dual focus of friendly class interaction and the opportunity to escape from urban problems.

In 1858, Olmsted formed a partnership with Calvert Vaux, an English architect, and they developed the prize winning design for Central Park in New York City. This project has since been viewed as the beginning of American landscape architecture (Morrow, 1987). (The term, landscape architect, itself was popularized by Olmsted). The immediate success of Central Park quickly led the firm to numerous other commissions. Among them was Prospect Park in Brooklyn which was designed and implemented between 1865 and 1868. Olmsted wrote about the social functions of Central Park and Prospect Park:

> Consider that the New York park and the Brooklyn park are the only place in those associated cities where in you will find a body of Christians coming together, and with an evident glee in the prospect of coming together, not at all intellectual, competitive with none, disposing to jealousy and spiritual or intellectual pride toward none, each individual adding by his mere presence to the pleasure of all others, all helping to the greater happiness of each. (Olmsted Sr., Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns, 1871)

Central and Prospect parks thus exemplify the intense connection between Olmsted's design philosophies and his ideas about social change. His parks were large landscapes in which views and vistas could be enjoyed, winding paths could be leisurely strolled, and meadows could be used for picnicking. Activities defined as "exertive recreation" included those now thought of as non-exertive such as a game of chess or a parade (Rainey, in press,p.15).

Stylistically, Olmsted's work was generally composed of a combination of the "beautiful" or "pastoral," and the "picturesque." The "beautiful" or "pastoral" style is characterized by "informal yet smoothly defined spaces, groupings and masses of trees surrounding broad meadows and smaller "bays" of space" (Cairns and Kessler, p. 52). This style was much like scenes of rural New England with which Olmsted became familiar as a child. The "picturesque" style is "a rough landscape type featuring wild imposing, dark masses of plantings in which the wilderness of nature, could be experienced" (Ibid).

Olmsted's work tended to rely most heavily on "pastoral" elements, with smaller sections of the "picturesque" used as an accent or contrast. Examples of such use of the "picturesque" are the Ramble in Central Park and the Ravine in Prospect Park. In addition, Olmsted integrated formally designed areas into his designs. These tended to be used as public gathering areas. They were places in which each person could add "by his mere presence to the pleasure of all others" (Olmsted Sr., 1871). Examples of a formal design treatment are the pedestrian boulevards culminating at the edge of the park lagoon at Central Park's Promenade and Bethesda Fountain and Prospect Park's Concourse. Music was played at these locations to drift across the water, adding to the serenity of the scene.

Olmsted and Vaux made their initial impact in the Chicago area in 1868. A development firm, the Riverside Improvement Company, hired them for the planning and design of the entire suburban community of Riverside. Located nine miles west of Chicago, the 1600 acre site was bisected by the Des Plaines River. Along its banks, Olmsted placed common grounds to be used by the entire community. He had envisioned a boulevard connecting Riverside with Chicago. Along this boulevard Olmsted intended for people to stroll leisurely as they did in along European promenades, and in his New York Parks. This boulevard was never fully realized. However, Olmsted's plan Riverside was "a bold experiment- a suburban village whose ideal... would be to provide private homes and lots in a framework of public parks and parkways, a community whose every intent was to provide the comforts of city-living with the benefits of the rural countryside" (Cairns and Kessler, p.20).

Of the three original park systems, only the South Park Commission contracted the Olmsted firm for the landscape design of its initial parks. Frederick Law Olmsted's influence, however, clearly extended to the design and planning of the West parks and Lincoln Park as well. His influence on the design of the West parks was particularly strong . William Le Baron Jenney, who was responsible for the design of Humboldt, Garfield, and Douglas Parks served on the Union Army during the Civil War, as Olmsted had. The two men met at the siege of Vicksburg and a lifetime relationship of professional cooperation and correspondence began (Turak, p. 39). In 1868, Jenney collaborated with Olmsted and Vaux on the planning and design of Riverside.

Illinois. Jenney executed the construction of the plan and designed many of the first buildings in the community.

South Park Commission

In 1869, one year after the firm began planning Riverside, Olmsted and Vaux were retained by the South Park Commission. They were responsible for designing: South Park, which was composed of the upper division (Washington Park), lower division (Jackson Park), and the Midway Plaisance, the closed rectangular ground which linked the upper and lower divisions. According to Dr. Charles E. Beveridge, this commission:

> ...gave Olmsted his first opportunity to design a system of recreational grounds with more than one landscape park: the careful planning to develop a separate and unique character for each park presaged the multi-park systems he would later design for Buffalo, Boston, Rochester, Louisville, and Milwaukee (Walmsely Proposal).

The commission to design South Park also established a long-standing professional relationship between Frederick Law Olmsted and Chicago's South Park System.

The Olmsted and Vaux plan was completed in 1871. Its implementation, however, was slowed by the destruction the South Park Commission administrative offices during the Chicago Fire. In 1872, Horace W.S. Cleveland was hired as the South Park Commission's landscape architect to modify and oversee the implementation of the Olmsted and Vaux plan. Cleveland (1814-1900) had training in agriculture, civil engineering, and horticulture and experience as a surveyor. His landscape architectural practice began in partnership with Robert Morris Copeland in the 1850s. Cleveland went on to collaborate with Olmsted and Vaux on the design of Prospect Park. He came to Chicago in 1869, having learned that the city "following the example of New York and Brooklyn , had acquired public lands for future development" (Newton, p. 310).

Cleveland did not take issue with the responsibility of implementing the Olmsted and Vaux plan. Olmsted and Cleveland "had tremendous respect for each other's professional ability." (Tishler and Luckhardt, p. 281) Like Olmsted, Cleveland written and published his socially motivated design philosophies. He was particularly interested in taking the natural landscape into consideration in the design process. He asserted that "This is the raw material which is placed in our hands to be moulded into shape for the habitation of a nation, and such as we create, it must essentially remain for all future time" (Cleveland, Billerica).

Though Cleveland did not end his employment with the South Park Commission on good terms, he had a long and productive career. In addition to his Chicago work, he was responsible for designing numerous projects including cemeteries, university campuses, suburban communities, and park systems in numerous locations throughout the United States, but particularly in the Midwest. Many of his projects were done in partnership with the civil engineer, William M.R. French. Among Cleveland's most noted works are the Minneapolis and Omaha park systems.

By 1875, a great deal of the Washington Park landscape design had been implemented. "There were boats to row on the pond, and weekly open-air concerts drew large crowds" (Ranney p. 33). Four boulevards, Grand, Drexel, Pavilion and Oakwood were in place:

> Along these boulevards great mansions sprung up, and a drive to South Park became a fashionable outing for the wealthy. Those who lacked private carriages could ride in the horsedrawn phaeton which regularly left the corner of Drexel and Oakwood Boulevards for a thirty-cent tour of the parks. (Ranney, 1982, p. 33)

Washington Park did not continue to develop exactly as Olmsted had intended. Numerous buildings and recreational facilities were added. However, in spite of these changes, the Park maintained its pastoral character.

The development of Jackson Park was never as closely related to Olmsted's original plan as Washington Park had been. The nearly six hundred acre lakefront site which by the early 1890s was still "a flat, uninteresting piece of sandy soil with some scrubby trees" offered great potential for the implementation of a design which would have international significance (Newton, p. 357). Frederick Law Olmsted and Daniel H. Burnham (1846-1912) provided guidance to a team of renowned designers through their roles as Chief Landscape Architect and Chief Architect.

Burnham (1846-1912) and his partner John W. Root (1850-91) had been instrumental in developing the skyscraper. In addition to major tall buildings in Chicago such as the Rookery, the Montauk, and the Monadnock Buildings, the two men were responsible for designing hundreds of private houses, hotels, schools, hospitals, churches, and railroad stations throughout the United States. Though Root had been serving the role of Architect for the Columbian Exposition, he died suddenly in 1891 and Burnham took his place. According to Thomas Elliot, throughout Burnham's career he displayed a "classical attitude," which Kenyon Cox defined as "the disinterested search for perfection;...the love of clearness and reasonableness and self control;...above all, the love of permanence and of continuity." (Kenyon Cox as quoted in Thomas Elliott, "Daniel Burnham: A Consistent Classicist," Classical America, 4 (1977), p. 188). This attitude was especially clear in Burnham's involvement in the Fair.

Jackson Park was transformed into the White City. The focal point was Olmsted's formal canal with Daniel Chester French's bronze statue, the Republic in the center. This Court of Honor was flanked by buildings designed by the team of architects who came together from locations throughout the nation. The result was a composition of monumental classical buildings unified by an even cornice line In its day, the Fair was viewed as a major social achievement:

> The White City was the most socialistic achievement of history, the result of many minds inspired by a common aim working for the common good... The individual was great but the collectivity was greater...More than that, the Chicago World's Fair was a miniature of the ideal city. (Charles Zueblin, A Decade of Civic Improvement, Chicago, 1905 pp. 60-61).

The ideal of social democracy soon became associated with classical architecture which was gaining popularity. The World's Columbian Exposition was an important model for the City

Beautiful Movement which proliferated during the early part of the twentieth century throughout the nation.

By the time Olmsted began working on the Columbian Exposition, his stepson John (1852-1920) became a full partner in the firm, and Charles Eliot (1859-97), son of the President of Harvard University was taken into apprenticeship. In 1893, Eliot also joined in the partnership and the firm became known as Olmsted, Olmsted, and Eliot. Olmsted's younger son Frederick Jr. who was attending Harvard, spent his summers working on the fair project, and later joined the firm. When the Columbian Exposition was dismantled in 1895, Olmsted, Olmsted and Eliot was contracted for the redesign of Jackson Park.

Though Olmsted Sr. had taken ill and went into retirement by the time the firm was engaged in redesigning Jackson Park, the formal elements were removed and the landscape was brought to the pastoral state in which he had originally intended. Daniel Burnham was shocked when he realized that the Grand Canal of the White City would be removed. He wrote to a friend:

> The scheme of Jackson Park is very poor and uninteresting. I was utterly astonished to find them destroying the canals and the grand basin; this seemed to me a bloodless proceeding. I know it never came from the Frederick Law Olmsted of old (Letter from D.H. Burnham to Mr. Ware, BLB).

Charles Eliot died in 1897, and Olmsted Sr. died in 1903. The firm passed into the hands of Olmsted's sons under the name of the Olmsted Brothers.

Though Olmsted Sr. had intended for for Jackson and Washington parks to retain a strong pastoral character, many of the improvements in these parks undertaken between Olmsted Sr 's death and the consolidation of the Chicago Park District in 1934 were formal and architectural in nature. The Olmsted Brothers disagreed with the introduction of formal gardens, additional buildings and recreational facilities. However, the South Park Commission felt that these were necessary changes. In Washington Park, the D.H. Burnham firm was responsible for the design of a South Park Administration Building with formal rose gardens, and a Refectory Building which were constructed in 1911. A Beach Pavilion Building was constructed in Jackson Park in 1919. This was designed in-house, by South Park Commission staff. Its design was clearly influenced by the D.H. Burnham Company's work for the South Park Commission. Throughout the early part of the Twentieth Century, Jackson and Washington Parks continued receiving changes as were demanded by the growing use of automobiles and trends in active recreation.

West Park Commission

The Act which created the West Park Commission in 1869 mandated the creation of specific parklands as had the separate Act which established South Park Commission. The West Park Commission was chartered with responsibility of creating three large parks, originally called North, Middle, and South Parks, and interconnecting boulevards. Middle was renamed Central Park, and the three parks were later renamed Humboldt, Garfield and Douglas Parks.

William Le Baron Jenney (1832-1907), an architect, engineer, and planner who is best known for his pioneering efforts in steel skeleton construction, received the commission for

designing the West parks and boulevards. He was from a well-to-do New England family. He had studied civil engineering at Harvard University, but then transferred to the Ecole Central des Arts et Manufactures in Paris where he was trained in landscape engineering from 1853 to 1856.

When Jenney began working on the West Park Commission's three large parks, Humboldt, Garfield, and Douglas in 1870, he drew inspiration from Central Park in New York. He felt that its design "surpasses anything of the kind in the world" (from Threshold article--Loring and WLB Jenney, Principles and Practice of Architecture) In addition, Jenney had written to Olmsted, directly requesting advice for his West park design work. In return, he had received "a long and instructive letter" from Olmsted (Threshold article). Though that letter has been lost, Olmsted's influence on Jenney's West Park work has recently received critical attention. Scholars believe that Olmsted probably recommended that because of the relatively small size of the three West parks (less than 200 acres each compared to the 844 acres of New York's Central Park) functions be spatially divided. In addition, it is likely that he advised that the "picturesque" style be relied upon more heavily than the "pastoral" due to the lack of wide expanses of space for open meadows.

Jenney's stylistic inspiration also came from the great parks of Paris. He was a student in Paris during Baron Hausmann and Adolphe Alphand's seminal park and boulevard development (Turak, Inland Architect.,"William LeBaron Jenney: Pioneer of Chicago's West Parks", p. 39) The smaller scale of the West Park landscapes were particularly conducive to French park designs, which, as Theodore Turak has explained, were more tightly composed than English landscapes or Olmsted's work. "Paths were sections of circles or ellipses with plantings and flower beds considered as finite entities." (Turak, p. 45).

In 1877, Jenney resigned from his position as Architect and Engineer to the West Park Commission. His reasons for leaving the West Park System are not clear, however, it is likely that he wanted to devote time to his architectural practice. "He continued to have a cordial relationship with the Commission and served from time to time as a consultant and later designed some park buildings" (Threshold, p. 10). Jenney's former employee, O.F. Dubuis, was appointed to the position under the title of Engineer. Dubuis made substantial modifications to Jenney's plans. These alterations were often made to accommodate the changing transportation usage, as horse drawn carts and carriages were becoming outmoded and the automobile was becoming common. Among such changes major thoroughfares bisected the parks. In Dubuis' 1885 plan for Douglas Park, Ogden Avenue cuts through the landscape in a diagonal slash.

The architecture of the three West parks also tended to be "picturesque" in style. Many of these buildings were constructed in the early and mid-1890s. Among them were a Jenney stable and shop building in Garfield Park, and a similar building by Frommann and Jebsen in Humboldt Park. Park buildings of this period generally had specific single functions. They were often architectural follies of exotic styles such as the J.L. Silsbee Byzantine bandstand in Garfield Park.

Shortly after the turn of the century, Prairie style landscape features and buildings were incorporated into the three large pleasure grounds. Jens Jensen was responsible for these additions. Jensen (1860-1951) was a Danish immigrant, who began working as a gardener for the West Park Commission in 1886. Enchanted by the native Illinois prairie, he wondered why such a

"great spiritual force" of the areas' natural landscape had been overlooked in the design of the parks (Jensen, Siftings, pp. 33-34). He began a process of experimentation by planting what he called an "American Garden" in Union Park composed entirely of native flowers. Between 1900 and 1905, the five year period between his firing and re-hiring, he established a private practice and continued exploring a naturalistic design philosophy. Eventually, Jensen's work evolved into what is now considered the Prairie style in landscape architecture. This historic landscape style has recently received critical attention. Though it was mostly practiced in the Midwest, Prairie style landscapes are now receiving the same level of acclaim as Prairie style architecture has for many years.

While Jensen is commonly credited for developing the Prairie style in landscape design it should be understood that the development of the style required many years of experimentation. A significant part of this process occurred when Jensen returned to the West Park Commission in September of 1905. The large acreage and poor condition of Humboldt, Douglas and Garfield Parks and associated boulevards afforded him the opportunity to replace Picturesque elements with those which emulated the native landscape. Jensen made major alterations to the landscapes. Though he did include formal gardens in each of the three parks, he also added large quantities of native plants, broad horizontal meadows, stratified stonework, and the redesign of a Jenney lagoon to a narrow winding waterway like a miniature prairie river.

Jensen's love of the native landscape also influenced architectural changes in the large parks. He had convinced the Board of Commissioners to demolish each of the three existing small conservatories in Humboldt, Douglas and Garfield Parks which had originally been conceived of by Jenney, to build one large conservatory in Garfield Park. Collaborating with Hitchings and Company, an engineering firm from New York, Jensen designed a conservatory to emulate "a field of large haystacks he had seen once while crossing the Nebraska prairie by rail" (Vinci and Christy, 1982.). The West Park System also commissioned the Prairie style architect Hugh Garden (1873-1961) of the firm Schmidt, Garden, and Martin to design buildings, structures and site furnishings for the redesigned sections of the three parks. Changing political tides prompted Jensen to shift his role from the staff position of General Superintendent and Chief Landscape Architect to consulting Landscape Architect from 1909 to 1920. Frustrated by the increasing political corruption of the West Park Commission, Jensen resigned from his consulting position in 1920 (Collier, p. 231).

The buildings which resulted from the major improvement project of 1927 were stylistically quite different from those which had been influenced by Jens Jensen. The firm of Michaelson and Rognstad was retained to design the major structures included in this improvements program. Christian S. Michaelsen (1888- 1960) had been trained in the office of Arthur Heun and later worked for Howard Van Doren Shaw. Sigurd Anton Rognstad (1892- 1937) had trained in the office of Frederick W. Perkins, an architect who, like Heun and Shaw, specialized in residential design work for the social elite. Michaelson and Rognstad formed a partnership in 1920. They received numerous commissions including the On Leong Merchants Association Building, the Midwest Hotel and Athletic Club in Chicago and the renovation of the State Capitol dome in Springfield, Illinois. Michaelson and Rognstad were hired to design numerous structures for the West Park Commission which were completed in 1928 including: a Roque Court Building, Service Building and West Park Commission Administration Building in Garfield Park, all

composed of buff brick, terra cotta and clay tile roofs and executed in the Mediterranean style, and an identical elaborate Georgian Revival style Boat House/Refectory Building in Douglas and Humboldt Parks.

Lincoln Park Commission

Like the other large, perimeter "pleasure grounds" the development of Lincoln Park was also chartered by the 1869 legislation. In fact, the Park played a major role in mobilizing the city's early park advocates to lobby for the original legislation. However, because the Lincoln Park Commission was not established as municipal corporation, it did not have the funds or political tools to commission great comprehensive design work. Rather, the park developed on a piecemeal basis. Some of the initial plantings had been laid out in 1863, prior to the inception of the Lincoln Park Commission, by John Ure, a carpenter who had become a gardener. In 1865, the year in which the park was officially named Lincoln Park, a Swedish landscape gardener, Swain Nelson developed a plan which refined and expanded upon Ure's work, and excavated the first lakes.

Lincoln Park underwent a number of boundary extensions between 1869, when the Lincoln Park Commission began to oversee the development and maintenance of the Park, and 1934 when this responsibility was assumed by the Chicago Park District. Between the 1870s and early 1880s, the north boundary was extended to Diversey Parkway. O. Bensen, Nelson's partner developed a plan which incorporated Nelson's earlier work and included the extension. This older section of the Park (North Ave. to Diversey Pkwy.) was generally executed in the "picturesque" style. Additional gardeners and landscape architects who were involved in improvements and redesigns included Carl Strombach and Ossian C. Simonds. Now noted for contributing to the development of the Prairie style in landscape design, Simonds (1855-1931) was responsible for such notable projects as Graceland Cemetery, and public parks in Quincy, Springfield, and Dixon, Illinois; Hannibal, Missouri; and Madison, Wisconsin. He served as gardener for the Lincoln Park from 1908 through 1911 and consulting landscape gardener in 1912.

Architectural and landscape changes were numerous throughout the Park's history of extensions and additions. These never followed a comprehensive plan though certain amenities were added throughout the entire park, such as new lighting standards after the turn of the century. A greenhouse which dated from 1878 was replaced by a J.L. Silsbee designed "Conservatory-Palm House-Fernery and Orchid House" in 1892. A Dwight Perkins Prairie style Refectory Building replaced an earlier Victorian building of the same function in 1908. (A biographical sketch of Dwight H. Perkins appears in the following section.) Perkins was also responsible for the 1912 design of the Lion House in Lincoln Park Zoo. In the mid 1920s and early 1930s several Classical Revival buildings were constructed which were designed by an architect named Edwin H. Clark.

THE THREE ORIGINAL PARK COMMISSIONS ABILITY TO CREATE ADDITIONAL PARKLANDS 1895-1934

By the late 1890s a new wave of dissatisfaction with parkland in Chicago became prevalent. The existing parks were no longer serving all of the city's residents. Chicago was experiencing tremendous industrial growth. Immigrants from countries all over the world were arriving with hopes of achieving the "American dream." In 1850, Chicago was a city of 30,000

residents. By 1890 the population had climbed to more than one million. With the rapid growth, the city was transforming into a series of "...crowded, airless neighborhoods of people with widely-differing backgrounds, many of whom were without sanitary or recreational facilities of any sort" (Vinci and Christy, 1982, pp. 8).

Generated by members of the social elite, a new crusade to create more parks was one aspect of a national Progressive Reform Movement in which Chicago was a leading city. Jane Addams made major contributions. Recognizing the severity of the deplorable living and working conditions generated by the city's rapid industrialization, she established Hull House, the nation's first settlement house. Located within a densely populated immigrant neighborhood, Hull House provided health, educational and social services to anyone in need. By 1894, a University of Chicago Professor, Graham Taylor, founded the Chicago Commons Settlement, and other such houses quickly followed. Unlike the previous more conservative philanthropists' charity efforts, the progressive reformers did not leave the neighborhood at dusk, but actually lived in the settlement houses. In the 1890s Hull House residents witnessed a group of neighborhood boys fishing for rats between the slats of a wooden sidewalk (Palmer, Saturday Evening Post, 1901). This incident spurred them into efforts to create healthy environments for play. Chicago's first playgrounds were soon established by the settlement houses, generally on land donated or lent by public minded citizens.

These Chicago social reformers were participating in a national play movement. The earliest documented public playgrounds were in Boston in 1886. They were inspired by Dr. Marie Zakerzewska who had seen children's sand lots in Berlin and convinced the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association to create similar play spaces. Additional efforts to create clean and safe play areas were inspired by Jacob Riis' dramatic book, How the Other Half Lives. Riis became a national spokesman for the play movement. It was believed that disciplined, active recreation could cure the numerous urban ills thought to be driving tenement children to crime and violence. The reformers advocated an extremely structured environment with rigidly supervised games and use of gym apparatus.

South Park Commission

The South Park Commission was the first of three park systems to begin establishing parks in the congested tenement districts. In 1900, after a group of prominent Chicagoans had successfully lobbied for the earliest small parks legislation, the South Park Commission began acquiring the 34 acre site for the experimental McKinley Park near the Stock Yards. Equipped with a swimming pool and changing rooms, ball fields, and playgrounds the new park was an immediate success. This project was guided by J. Frank Foster who was the General Superintendent of the South Park Commission from 1892 to 1925. Foster was largely responsible for the South Park Commission's progressive attitude. He conceived of program components for the new neighborhood parks. In addition to those in McKinley Park, Foster believed that the parks should have: indoor and outdoor gymnasiums for men and women, a running track, a wading pool, sand pits, and a community center with assembly and club rooms, and landscaping.

The tremendous success of McKinley Park eventually led the South Park Commission to enlarge the property by 40 acres, providing for Foster's additional components. It also immediately prompted of the South Park Commission to engage in a comprehensive program of

establishing a system of fourteen neighborhood parks. The new parks would offer comfortable "breathing spaces" in the congested neighborhoods. In addition, numerous services would be provided including public bathing facilities, other health services, educational opportunities including vocational training, social and cultural programs and active recreation. In keeping with the South Park's tradition, the Olmsted Brothers were commissioned for the landscape architecture and the D.H. Burnham Company for the architectural design of the new parks.

The system of fourteen parks included six which were considered squares because they were on properties less than 10 acres in size, and eight considered small parks because they were larger than 10 acres. The program for each of the fourteen parks relied upon all of the components which had been conceived of by J. Frank Foster. With a compact area to work with, particularly in the squares, the Olmsteds felt that the ornamental planting and curving walkways of the traditional "pleasure grounds" should be sacrificed to the open space needed for games. The South Park Commission was certain, however, that even the compact squares should not be "strictly the athletic kind" and should include landscaped areas for relaxation (S.P.C. Annual Report, 1905, p. 49).

To reckon with the program requirements in such small areas, devote space to open landscape, and create an orderly whole, the Olmsteds were influenced by a European idea, the concept of zoning. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. was greatly interested in experiments in zoning. By using zoning techniques, resulting park designs achieved a synthesis of the program requirements that could allow for greater supervision, and landscape areas which emphasized a modified version of the older large parks. Within this structure, the fieldhouse became the focal point of the landscape.

Prior to the neighborhood parks movement, fieldhouses did not exist. Parks had long since had refectories, boathouses and other buildings geared toward specific uses, generally oriented towards passive recreation. However, Foster's vision required a building type which would combine educational and social purposes with that of indoor athletics. The program drew from the settlement house's concept of social center and the play movement's emphasis on active recreation. The building type was conceived of a as community club house where families could recreate together and as one Commissioner explained, "Keep the boys and girls out of mischief." (Chicago Examiner, 2/5/1904). The fieldhouses generally included a branch of the public library, a lunch room, club rooms, and assembly rooms. In addition, the buildings enabled active recreation to take place in the parks even during Chicago's bitter winters.

Daniel Burnham's protegee, Edward Bennett (1874-1954) was responsible for the design of the architecture of the South Park Commission's neighborhood parks. Though he had not been with the D.H.Burnham firm during the planning for the World's Columbian Exposition, he believed that "classical elements are best for the public realm"(Bennett, Monitor 30 December 1926, Ryerson and Burnham Library). The new park buildings evoked the image of the Fair's uniform cornice line and grouping of structures which formed a Court of Honor. In several instances, the park's swimming tank was placed within the outdoor architectural complex, forming, on a microcosmic scale, the Court of Honor around a body of water.

The parks were meant to provide a healthy and controlled environment in the overcrowded neighborhoods of the period. The services which were offered by these parks included: medical attention from doctors and nurses who volunteered their time; a variety of educational programs including English and American history lessons, and vocational training such as millinery, printing, wood crafts etc.; hot meals sold at cost; hot showers, soap and clean towels; athletic equipment, supervision and organized competitive sports; and social programs .

By 1906 all of the design work for the South Park Commission neighborhood parks was completed, and ten of the original fourteen parks had been constructed. Within months of the construction of Chicago's first neighborhood parks, the D.H. Burnham Company included the new park form into its plan for San Francisco. This set a precedent for the development of neighborhood parks throughout the United States. The immediate success of the South Park Commission small parks encouraged the fledgling Playground and Recreation Association of American to hold its first annual convention in Chicago in 1907. Prior to the meeting, President Theodore Roosevelt had issued a public statement suggesting that municipalities send representatives to the conference: "... to see the magnificent system that Chicago has erected in its South Park district, one of the most notable civic achievements of any American City" (SPC Annual Report, 1909, p. 37).

The four remaining South Park Commission neighborhood park plans which had not been constructed by 1906 were delayed because of problems with land acquisition and increasing costs of labor and materials (Breen, W.P.A.). Three of the four were developed between 1908 and 1930. The South Park Commission's program to create additional parks did not end with the thirteen of the fourteen originally proposed, however. As early as 1907, the Commission began efforts to continue extending the program. In that year they began proceedings for land acquisition to develop four more parks. The Olmsted Brothers were contracted in 1911 for the landscape plans. The buildings, however, tended to be designed by in-house staff. Though the buildings were influenced by the earlier D.H. Burnham and Company structures, and the landscapes were designed by the Olmsteds, the Commissioners, staff members and community members had greater input in the design process. The resulting parks tended to be more formal but less sophisticated than those of the first grouping. In addition, unlike the original approach taken by the Olmsteds and the Burnham Company, some identical designs were used.

The South Park Commission continued its efforts to create additional parks and enlarge existing parks throughout the remaining years prior to consolidation in 1934. Many of the parks were developed over a long period of with a lengthy process of land acquisition and incremental improvements. Existing parks such as Gage and Calumet were enlarged. Calumet increased by approximately 100 acres in size when the Commission was enabled to create boundary extensions from landfill. Additional parks such as Madden and J. Frank Foster Parks were created in the 1920s with some improvements in the early 1930s and others after the consolidation of commissions into the Chicago Park District in 1934.

West Park Commission

Though ten South Park Commission neighborhood parks had been constructed by 1906, not a single neighborhood park had yet opened in the areas within the jurisdiction of the West Park Commission. Ironically, some of west side neighborhoods were the poorest and most densely

populated in the city. The delay was caused by the Commission's numerous problems including political corruption, financial difficulties and legal complications. The situation continued until a couple of years after the new West Park Commission administration was put in place in by the governor,Charles S. Deneen. Faced with the numerous problems left behind by its predecessor, the new West Park Commission had a slow start increasing neighborhood parks. Land acquisition in such crowded districts was a problem, and the Commission did not have a strong tax base. The new Commission resolved to establish very small new parks. It settled the legal issues and began acquiring property in 1907. Jensen began developing plans, and William Carbys Zimmerman (1856-1932), who had been appointed State Architect by Governor Deneen, began designing the architecture. The West Park Commission had officially opened its first three neighborhood parks by 1910.

In Jensen's initial neighborhood park designs of 1907, he could only express his naturalistic philosophies in a limited way. Within the small sites, he needed to include all of components which had been pioneered by the South Parks. In addition, he was interested in promoting the positive effects of nature and emphasizing social and educational services. Jensen's interest in educating people about nature led him to introduce such innovations as community gardens for adults and children into the new parks.

The new parks met with immediate success and the Commission immediately began efforts to establish additional neighborhood parks. These efforts led to the creation of five new neighborhood parks and another which resulted from the redesign of an existing city park. All six were completed by 1917. Though in general, the space planning constraints of neighborhood parks only afforded Jensen subtle references to his Prairie style, in one of this second grouping of parks he was able to achieve one neighborhood park which was fully rendered in the Prairie style. This was the 1916 plan for Franklin Park. The West Park Commission approved its design, considering it a "radical change from what we so far have been accustomed to in the development of our playgrounds." William Grower, then President of the West Park Board characterized the park's design as "...an expression of landscape art and an attempt to idealize the local color or native landscape of the region" (W.P.C., Annual Report, 1914, p. 21).

Jensen's interest in the Prairie style also influenced the architecture of the neighborhood parks. The buildings were designed by William Carbys Zimmerman who was not thought of as a Prairie School architect. A graduate of M.I.T., he specialized in residential work in the revival and eclectic styles of popular taste first in a partnership with John Flounders and later in private practice. Zimmerman utilized a Prairie style vocabulary for much of the neighborhood park architecture.

The West Park Commission continued making efforts for expanding the System. Between 1911 and 1915 the Commission acquired the first large tract of land (135 acres) for park development since 1869. Planned at the western limits of the city, this became Columbus Park, Jensen's first opportunity to develop a large Prairie style park for the West Park Commission. In a 1930 article entitled "The Naturalistic Treatment in a Metropolitan Park" Jensen asserted that the Columbus Park design was "as much an attempt to realize a complete interpretation of the native landscape of Illinois as anything which the author has done." (American Landscape Architecture, January, v. 2.)

Ultimately, Jensen's plan for the Park became part of a visionary proposal for a Greater West Park System. Conceived of between 1916 and 1919, Jensen developed an ambitious plan for a huge network of new west parks, playgrounds, parkways and community gardens. Including mutual efforts with other public agencies the proposed park system:

> ...was massive, extending along both branches of the Chicago River, and north and south along the Des Plaines- a total agglomeration of land that, had it been acquired would dwarf Lincoln, Washington, and Jackson parks combined (Henderson, Reader , pp. 26-27).

This vision for a "Greater West Park System" was never realized. However, during the same period in which Jensen was making studies which led to the plan, he proposed the Board of Education and West Park Commission purchase adjacent tracks of land to develop an interlocking educational and park facility (Breen, W.P.A.). This effort became the impetus for the creation of La Follette Park in 1919. Though Jensen had intended for the park property to remain as open space and the school facilities to offer the built recreational structure, the West Park Commission developed a large Michaelson and Rognstad fieldhouse in La Follette Park during the major improvements program of 1928.

As early as 1917, the Board of Commissioners were making design decisions which conflicted with Jensen's wishes. He had intended for Prairie style buildings in Columbus Park. Instead, eclectic structures such as the Locker and Shower Building designed by John Christiansen were constructed by the West Park Commission. Again frustrated with West Park Commission politics, Jensen resigned from his position as consulting landscape architect in 1920.

Lincoln Park Commission

Like the West Park Commission, the Lincoln Park Commission did not begin a successful neighborhood parks program until 1907. However, its difficulties were not related to political corruption. Its status as a quasi-City agency was a deterrent, and the Lincoln Park Commission had been devoting most of its energies into expanding Lincoln Park. In 1903, the Special Park Commission had recommended sites for the development of small parks within the area, but the Lincoln Park system reported that it did not have the financial means to begin a program. When the Commission raised the capital, there were protests by some area residents against playgrounds, in favor of open landscapes. Unswayed by these objections, the Lincoln Park Commission began developing neighborhood parks which included the same program components as the other two Commissions.

For the redesign of an existing park into a playground, and the design of three new neighborhood parks, the Lincoln Park Commission hired Dwight H.Perkins (1867-1941), an architect who was significant in the play and settlement house movements. In addition to his involvement with the Special Parks Commission, he had designed the University of Chicago Settlement House and was serving as the architect for the Board of Education. Perkins had come to Chicago in 1888 and worked for Daniel H. Burnham, running the office of Burnham and Root during the preparation of the World's Columbian Exposition. Establishing his own office in 1894, he became one of a group of Chicago architects who were exploring the Prairie style.

Within the jurisdiction of the Lincoln Park Commission there were districts which were more affluent than those areas addressed by the play movement. As neighborhood parks began opening in nearby areas, these middle class residents requested that parks be created in their neighborhoods. The parks which resulted often deviated from the existing neighborhood parks. As they did not have to address the same social agenda, they tended to differ in program and design.

Between 1908 and 1934, the Lincoln Park Commission established six neighborhood parks and redeveloped two others which had been early City parks transferred to the Commission. Most of the Lincoln Park Commission's parks were named to honor the Cabinet Members who served under President Abraham Lincoln. These included: William H. Seward, Secretary of State; Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War; Hannibal Hamlin, Vice-President; Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy; and Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury.

Creation of New Parklands Along Chicago's Lakefront

In 1920, after years of numerous complicated legal battles, the development of the lakefront parks began in earnest. The Lakefront Ordinance allowed the extension of Grant Park beyond the IC tracks. Plans for developing Grant Park had begun as early as 1903. In that year, the Olmsted Brothers developed a formal plan which placed the Field Museum and the Crerar Library in the Park, in addition to the existing 1893 Art Institute Building. This Olmsted Brothers plan was incorporated into Daniel Burnham's 1909 Plan of Chicago. This plan for Grant Park was never executed, however, because of a lawsuit filed by Montgomery Ward to keep the lakefront east of Michigan Avenue as open space, free of buildings.

However, the Edward Bennett plans for Grant Park, which were implemented in the 1920s, remained true to the Burnham concept of a formal garden in the heart of the city. The centerpiece for the design became the Buckingham Fountain donated by Kate Buckingham in honor of her brother, Clarence, in 1922. Although buildings were prohibited in the majority of the park two Beaux Arts structures were constructed on the southern periphery of Grant Park. These were cultural facilities as intended by the South Park Commission: the D.H. Burnham and Company designed Field Museum and the Graham, Anderson, Probst, and White designed Shedd Aquarium.

The Lakefront Ordinance also influenced the development of Burnham Park in 1920. The plan called for extensive landfill and the construction of five islands extending into the Lake at various points between 12th and 55th Streets. Only one of these, the Northerly Island, was constructed. Contracts for the Burnham Park landfill were awarded in 1920. The first year's work amounted to nearly fifteen acres. Numerous incremental additions were made. By 1934, Burnham Park consisted of nearly 600 acres of reclaimed land.

The first structure in Burnham Park was constructed between 1922 and 1926 . This was Soldier Field, developed for festivals and athletic contests. Designed by Holabird and Roche, its monumental scale and classical details provided a smooth transition from the Beaux Arts buildings of the southern edge of Grant Park. The Adler Planetarium, designed by Ernest Grunsfeld, was constructed on the Northerly Island in 1930. Though pre-dating the Century of Progress, the 1933

World's Fair which was located in Burnham Park, the Adler Planetarium fit in well with the Fair's Art Deco temporary structures. The only permanent feature from the Fair was Burnham Harbor, also constructed of landfill.

Further South Park Commission extension efforts utilizing landfill occurred at Calumet Park. This was a neighborhood park which was part of the original proposed system of fourteen parks but delayed (see section above). In 1917-18 permission was granted to extend the breakwater in front of the park. In 1920 approximately 100 acres of landfill was added to the Park.

PARKS AND BOULEVARDS OF THE NINETEEN ADDITIONAL PARK COMMISSIONS 1895-1934

Between 1869 and the 1890s a number of townships were annexed to the city of Chicago. Thus, growing portions of the city were not within the jurisdiction of the South, West, and Lincoln Park Commissions. In 1895, due to increasing demands from these areas of the city, the State Legislature approved an Act which gave voters the opportunity to petition for the creation of park districts to serve their communities. This Act ultimately resulted in the creation of 19 additional park districts, bringing the total number to 22 by 1934, the year of consolidation.

By 1900, two groups, concerned with improving the roads, avenues and boulevards within their areas, particularly as a means of boasting real estate values, had taken advantage of the 1895 Act. They formed the Ridge Avenue and the North Shore Park Districts, both located on the north side of Chicago. Some of the new park commissions had existing parks created by the townships before annexation. However, the greatest impetus for the formation of new park commissions came from the growing neighborhood parks movement. The majority of the new park districts were formed between 1908 and 1920, coinciding with the major building activity of that movement as initiated by the three original park commissions.

Most of the new park commissions were located on the north and northwest sides of the city. Many of these communities were composed of middle class or upper middle class residents, unlike the poor immigrant communities which the South, West and Lincoln Park Commissions had addressed. The residents of the north and northwest side communities tended to live in single family houses or elegant apartment buildings with yards. Thus, the social needs of the new park districts were generally different from those served by the parks of the Progressive Reform Movement. Concentrated areas for active recreation were not necessary, nor were the same educational, health and hygiene services.

As the neighborhood parks of the 19 additional park districts began to develop, they were viewed more as an amenity of a good neighborhood and less as a vehicle for social change. These parks had great community significance. The formation of the nineteen additional park commissions tended to be generated by groups of residents concerned with the development and welfare of their neighborhoods. The commissioners were elected by the residents of each district. "They were individuals who took an active interest in local improvements rather than financial or civic developments of wider scope." In fact, of the "...seventy-five commissioners serving the small park districts in 1925, only eight were mentioned in biographical literature and only one of

these held any political office or other office of public service." (Halsey, 1940, pp. 93). The additional park commissions tended to have very small tax bases. Community participation and volunteerism were essential to the new commissions. They had few salaried staff positions other than custodians and lifeguards.

Due to the budget limitations, the additional park commissions tended to hire lesser known architects such as John T. Hetherington, W.W. Ahlschlager, William Jones, A. A. Schwartz, and Clarence Hatzfeld. There was generally little landscape design work. However, the architects were sometimes also responsible for landscape design work, and occasionally, lesser known landscape architects or contractors were hired. Individual landscape architects included Richard Gloede and Swain Nelson, and firms included the Chicago Landscaping Company, and the American Park Builder.

The pace of development of the parks of the nineteen additional park districts was slow. After the initial land acquisition it generally required a period of several years before any improvements could be made. If there were a landscape architect or firm, that work usually predated the design and construction of architecture. However, the lack of funds generally prevented the execution of elaborate landscape plans, although there were occasional formal gardens. The tendency, however, was to emphasize the natural aspects of a site rather than constructing a complete new design. Many of the new parks were sited along the north branch of the Chicago River, providing a good use of the flood plain, and strong natural amenities.

The fieldhouse was an important component of the new parks of the nineteen additional park districts. As these were neighborhood efforts with limited resources, it often required several years before a park district could construct a fieldhouse. Thus, no buildings were constructed until 1915, and the majority of the new fieldhouses were constructed in the late 1920s. The buildings were generally designed in the Revival styles which were reaching great popularity, and characterizing much of the residential architecture in the neighborhoods surrounding the new parks. In fact, Clarence Hatzfeld who was responsible for designing a total of 21 fieldhouses for the parks of 7 north and northwest side park districts, was also designing numerous houses and apartment buildings in the adjacent neighborhoods. Hatzfeld (1873-1943) was trained in the office of Julius Huber, a prominent Chicago architect. "In 1895, Hatzfeld joined the Chicago Architectural Club which brought him into contact with most of the city's important architects, including Dwight H. Perkins." (Commission on Chicago Landmarks, Villa District Nomination, p. 5). Hatzfeld shared an office with Perkins, and for a time, was employed by him.

Clubs, and the instruction of hobby activities were extremely popular in the neighborhood parks of the additional park commissions. By the early 1920s most of these parks offered classes in arts and crafts, woodworking, rug weaving, brass work, millinery, sewing, model airplanes, glass blowing, plastic art and photography. Drama instruction and the presentation of plays was also quite common. The fieldhouses generally had large auditorium rooms in which the performances were given. While all of these activities were clearly inspired by the earlier neighborhood parks of the South, West, and Lincoln Park Commissions the emphasis had shifted. Rather than attempting social reform, these parks were offering leisure time activities which were becoming commonly expected in middle class neighborhoods.

Active recreation was also included in the programming for these parks. Here again, however, the emphasis was not so much on the reform which had been intended by the pioneering neighborhood parks of the early part of the century. Rather, activities requiring facilities which a family would not likely have on its own property, such as tennis and swimming were emphasized. Organized sports were also popular. However, highly competitive activities were not the only sports offered. Nearly every one of these small parks had horse shoe courts.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE TWENTY-TWO SUPERSEDED PARK DISTRICTS 1934

The 1934 consolidation of the Twenty-two Superseded Park Districts into the Chicago Park District allowed for WPA park programs during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Unfortunately, the impact of this funding had some negative effects. Many of the efforts to remodel buildings and landscapes resulted in insensitive alterations and additions. In addition, low and deferred maintenance trends emerged. However, the WPA program also generated some significant design work for the existing parks. Due to the restructuring of the whole park system, these projects were undertaken by in-house Chicago Park District design staff.

When the hundreds of parks of the twenty two separate park districts were brought under the management of the Chicago Park District in 1934, they were in various conditions and states of completion. Many of the nineteen additional park districts had spent years working on land acquisition and had parks with minimal improvements. Thus, the Chicago Park District did not make any attempts at creating new parks. The efforts were concentrated on providing facilities in all of the numerous existing parks. The improvements made in neighborhood parks which had never been completed by the small park districts were often direct replicas of those pioneered by the South Park Commission, such as spray pools and pergolas. Playgrounds and facilities for active recreation were emphasized in these Chicago Park District improvement projects. Tennis courts were particularly popular. In addition, comfort stations (buildings which offered bathroom facilities) were constructed in all of the large regional parks during this period. These buildings were often constructed in brick, and designed in Revival styles.

One of the most important members of the Chicago Park District design staff during the WPA period was the landscape architect, Alfred Caldwell. Born in 1903, Caldwell had a childhood interest in nature, worked in nurseries, and was enrolled for one year in the landscape architecture department of the University of Illinois. In 1925 he was hired by Jens Jensen as a superintendent of construction. He continued to work in Jensen's private office until 1931, when Jens Jensen retired to the "Clearing," in Door County, Wisconsin.

Caldwell began his own practice after Jensen's retirement, but began to have difficulty upon the onset of the Depression. In 1934, Jensen wrote a letter of reference which stated "He who presents these lines to you has been my assistant for five years. Caldwell is an artist and a poet." (Richard Guy Wilson, LAM, Sept. 1977, p. 408). Between 1934 and 1936, he worked for the Dubuque, Iowa Park System. He then returned to Chicago after having secured a position with the Chicago Park District, where he remained until 1941. He then went into private practice frequently collaborating with Mies Van Der Rohe. In addition, he has had a distinguished career as a professor of landscape architecture at the Illinois Institute of Technology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the University of Southern California.

The landscape designs of Alfred Caldwell were greatly inspired by his mentor, Jens Jensen:

> Caldwell's art was one that worked in all areas, both large landscapes and small spaces. He saw the beauty Jensen found in our native landscape-- the flat horizon, outstretched hawthorns, stratified limestone rocks-- and further simplified that vision to bring people a then-contemporary expression of the need for beauty on public lands. (Vinci and Christy, Volume 1, pp. 13).

Among his Chicago Park District works were the landscape design of the Lily Pool at Lincoln Park Zoo, Montrose Harbor at Lincoln Park, and the redesign of Riis Park.

Another significant post-consolidation design by Alfred Caldwell was the Promontory Point at Burnham Park. Densely planted with native trees and wild flowers, the landfill extension became a landscape characteristic of Caldwell's work. Along with the landscape improvements a fieldhouse was constructed in 1937. The lannon stone structure with turret provided viewing onto Lake Michigan. It was designed by an in-house Chicago Park District staff architect, E.V. Buchsbaum.

Only a few significant buildings were designed by the Chicago Park District during the WPA period. Another fine E.V. Buchsbaum design which may have been influence by Keck and Keck's work was the North Avenue Beach House constructed in 1938. Its reference to a lake ship represents the transportation theme favored by designers of the "Machine Age." The building is a familiar visual feature of the Chicago Lakefront.

In 1939, the Chicago Park District constructed a building to serve as the Administration headquarters. Sited at the north end of Soldier Field, the building was designed by Holabird and Root. The building represents a "stripped down" version of classicism. Its severe square massing and lack of ornamental details were indicative of the International style which was rapidly gaining popularity in Chicago.

Properties which have regional and local significance may not have influenced the development of parks throughout the nation, but may reflect those trends. Regionally significant properties also include those which influenced the planning, design, programs, services, or events of parks, or elements of parks throughout the region, or which served important purposes to citizens throughout the region. This category also includes the work of craftsmen, architects, landscape architects, artists and planners whose work may not have been recognized on a national scale, but received more than local attention. An example of regionally important properties are the Prairie style fieldhouses designed by William Carbys Zimmerman. Properties which have local significance also include those which served important purposes to the community. This category also includes the work of craftsmen, architects, landscape architects, artists and planners whose work received local attention, particularly those who were popular in the neighborhoods in which the parks were located. Locally significant properties also include those which were established, developed and managed by members of the surrounding neighborhoods, and thus reflect the priorities, desires, and needs of the community. An example of locally significant properties are the designs of Clarence Hatzfeld.

As the urban park property type tends to be subject to a continuum of important changes, it is expected that eligible properties may have several periods of significance. The properties will generally consist of some combination of the following elements: architectural features, landscape architectural features, site furnishings, recreational facilities or equipment, and works of art. Parks will be evaluated to determine whether or not they have sufficient significance to be designated as a whole (as a historic district), or whether only elements of parks will be eligible for listing.

There may be cases in which properties will meet with National Register criteria consideration for special justification for listing. Park elements which have been moved, but continue to retain great significance may meet with Criteria Consideration B. This is likely to apply to pieces of sculpture as they were frequently moved from park to park. Criteria Consideration D. may apply to some properties such as the Couch Tomb in Lincoln Park. As the Chicago Park District begins restoring historic parks, cases may arise in which Criteria Consideration E. will apply. One example may be the reconstruction of the Casino Building at the South Shore Country Club. There may also be cases in which parks or park elements have commemorative value, but have significance beyond the commemorative association. In these cases Criteria Consideration F. will apply. Important monuments are examples.

EVALUATION OF INTEGRITY

In addition to evaluating the Chicago Park District's historic urban parks to determine whether they have sufficient significance to be designated in whole, or as elements, properties will be evaluated to determine whether the have enough integrity to be listed in whole or as elements. When whole parks do not retain sufficient integrity, elements (such as buildings, site-furnishings, and landscape features) will be evaluated to determine whether or not they have enough integrity to be individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The National Register Bulletin 18 "How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes" will serve as a guide for evaluating the integrity of historic urban parks. Properties will be evaluated to determine whether they retain integrity of location, spatial relationships/

setting, materials, vegetation, workmanship, feeling, and association. The integrity evaluation will rely upon analyses of the historic design intents associated with the various periods of significance and the degree to which the current property exemplifies those design intents. This endeavor is critical. It is recognized that not only are landscapes expected to change over time, but that the urban park property type is particularly subject to significant changes due to social conditions and the shifts in the expectations placed on these public open spaces.

The analysis of design intents will include not only the designers' philosophies, but those of the decision makers who shaped the development of the parks, and the demands and expectations from the users of parks. The evaluation of the current landscape will compare existing features with the determined design intents. Those features will include: physical boundaries, circulation systems, land forms, vegetation, buildings, structures, and objects. The degree to which a current landscape reflects its historic design intents, the amount of remaining original fabric, and reversibility of changes will all be considered in the evaluation of integrity. If a landscape is to have sufficient integrity, it should retain a framework or skeleton of the historic design intents, and major changes or alterations should be reversible.

Architectural or other contributing features which are being evaluated for individual listing should retain a higher degree of integrity than whole parks. These features must have the integrity to stand on their own without the strong context that an intact landscape gives. Urban parks or contributing features which are being nominated for historic significance will not have to retain as much integrity as those which are being nominated for design significance. In this situation association may be valued in lieu of lacking integrity. One example is Washington Square Park, which has great value in Chicago's social history. This park retains little design integrity, however, it never had strong design significance.

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

The multiple property listing for the historic resources of the Chicago Park District includes whole urban parks and individual contributing features which retain a high degree of integrity. The nomination is based on a framework of survey and research material which began in the 1940s and continues to be built upon. The first comprehensive work to document the historic parks was the 1941 Historical Register of the Twenty-two Superseded Park Districts (Breen, ed.). This study was conducted by the Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.) for the Chicago Park District. It provided historic documentation of all of Chicago's existing parks at that time.

Between the 1940s and 1980s few efforts were made to identify, evaluate or protect Chicago's historic parks. Though the Chicago Park District and the City of Chicago are separate and autonomous municipal agencies, concern about the deteriorating condition of the city's historic parks prompted the City of Chicago Department of Planning to sponsor a survey in 1982. Entitled "Inventory and Evaluation of the Historic Parks in the City of Chicago," the research was conducted by the consulting team of John Vinci, a preservation architect and Steve Christy, a landscape architect/ historian which was retained by the City of Chicago.

[X] See continuation sheet

H. Major Bibliographical References

Books:

Burnham, Daniel H. and Bennett, Edward H. Plan of Chicago. Prepared under the direction of The Commercial Club during the years MCMVI, MCMVII, and MCMVIII. Chicago: The Commercial Club, 1909.

Eaton, Leonard K. Landscape Artist in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Fein, Albert. Frederick Law Olmsted and the American Environmental Tradition, New York: George Braziller, 1972.

Halsey, Elizabeth. The Development of Public Recreation in Metropolitan Chicago. Chicago: Chicago Recreation Committee, 1940.

Jensen, Jens. Siftings. Chicago: R. F. Seymour, 1939.

[X] See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

- [ ] State historic preservation office
- [ ] Other State agency
- [ ] Federal agency
- [ ] Local government
- [ ] University
- [X] Other

Specify repository: Chicago Park District

I. Form Prepared By

name/title Julia Sniderman, Preservation Planning Sup. and William Tippens, Arch. Historian
organization Chicago Park District date Dec. 15, 1989
street & number 425 E. McFetridge #3C telephone (312) 294-2226
city or town Chicago state Illinois zip code 60605

The survey methodology included the historic documentation and evaluation of the Chicago Parks developed between 1869 and 1940. The historic documentation relied upon: research and review of materials at the Chicago Historical Society, the Municipal Reference Library, the Morton Arboretum; review of some materials made available by the Chicago Park District; review of materials collected by the Department of Planning; and personal interviews with persons familiar with park development. The evaluation included numerous site visits to approximately 280 parks between March of 1982 and January of 1983. The methodology also included a 5 point rating scale based upon significance and condition. The significance evaluation was based upon the tenet that "an era's best parks are those which responded most admirably to the challenge of the creative development of urban open space for public use." (Vinci and Christy, pp. 16). The study also relied upon a typology of: landscape parks, small parks, and individual buildings.

While the study provided an important framework, including the evaluation of critical buildings, monuments, and landscape features, it was determined that the rating system was not a reliable technique. In addition to the vagueness of the basic significance definition explained above, there were some problems with the typology used in that study. Parks were generally divided into two groups: landscape parks and small parks. The problems with the overlap inherent this typology are discussed in the introduction to the property type (section F.).

The City-sponsored survey generated a tremendous three volume document on Chicago's Historic Parks. Though later researchers have questioned the validity and reliability of the operational definition used for significance, the 5 point rating scale and the typology, it is widely recognized that this study has provided a strong foundation for understanding and evaluating the Chicago Park District's historic resources. Since 1983, the work has been greatly utilized by students, non-profit organizations such as the Friends of the Parks, and the Chicago Park District.

In 1986, after some changes in the administration of the Chicago Park District, tens of thousands of historic plans, documents and photographs which had been hidden away for many years in a sub-basement vault, were discovered. The availability of these materials in conjunction with a growing awareness of the significance of the associated historic resources prompted the Chicago Park District to begin preservation efforts. In 1987, William W. Tippens, a graduate student in Historic Preservation at Columbia University was hired as a summer intern to begin evaluating and cataloging the archival collection. Through this effort he determined that there was a gap in the existing research. He addressed this gap in his Master's Thesis entitled "Synthesis of Reform: The Development of the Small Parks in Chicago's and West Park Commissions."

Initiative for the preservation of Chicago's historic parks also came from the Commission on Chicago Landmarks. The Commission proposed that the two agencies jointly apply for a planning grant from the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. The grant was awarded in 1988. Julia Sniderman, a consultant specializing in landscape preservation was contracted by the Chicago Park District to work on the grant project.

Entitled "A Model Preservation Plan for Chicago's Parks," the project seeks to establish a comprehensive planning methodology for dealing with all of the city's historic park resources. Methodologies for analyzing, treating, and managing historic landscape resources are relatively new within the field of historic preservation. Thus, this project sought to review the current

methods and grapple with the specific needs, issues and problems in Chicago's historic parks in order to develop a new method which would be applied to five case study parks. The underlying objective of the project was to develop a technique which would improve the way in which the Chicago Park District deals with all of its historic landscape resources. In addition, it was expected that this effort would contribute to the emerging field of landscape preservation in a meaningful way.

In developing a methodology for assessing Chicago's historic parks it was recognized that the standard methodology used in historic/ architectural windshield survey would not readily apply to landscapes. Style, critical features, periods of significance and integrity of designed historic landscapes would not necessarily be as apparent as they are with historic architecture. Thus, it was recognized that a landscape survey should include: the identification of potentially significant historic landscapes, documentation based on historic research, and evaluation of current conditions. The methodologies of the following landscape surveys were reviewed:

-Historic Landscapes Survey National Survey Form (American Society of Landscape Architects, developed in 1984 and recently revised)
-Massachusetts Olmsted Survey (Massachusetts Association for Olmsted Parks, 1982)
-Ohio Historic Landscapes Survey (Ohio Chapter of the ASLA and the Ohio Office of Historic Preservation c. 1985)
-Olmsted Survey in Riverside, Illinois (Riverside Historic Preservation Commission, 1986)
-Highland Park, Illinois Landscape Survey (Highland Park Historic Preservation Commission, 1988)
-Louisville, Kentucky Olmsted Survey (Louisville Friends of Olmsted Parks, 1988)

The recently published National Park Service Bulletin #18 entitled "How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes" (Keller and Keller, 1988) also provided an important framework for the development of the methodology. It was particularly helpful in defining integrity. Another source which contributed to the definition of integrity was the National Park Service guidance paper "Evaluating Deteriorated, Damaged, or Previously Altered Buildings within Registered Historic Districts" (1986, U.S. Dept. of the Interior). Though this document pertains to architecture, it provided excellent definitions for various kinds of integrity (setting, location, design, feeling, design, workmanship, materials etc.) which translated well to landscape surveys. Rebuilding Central Park: A Management and Restoration (New York City Dept. of Parks and Rec. and Central Park Conservancy, 1987) was also reviewed for the development of the methodology. This document does not include a detailed explanation of the methodology used for the historic analysis. Rather, throughout the document, discussion of the historic development of project areas is interspersed. However, this document was particularly helpful after the initial survey forms were pre-tested for this study, and it was determined that the analysis of the whole park was unmanageable. Based upon the Central Park study, a method of dividing the park into sub-areas was developed.

The result of the review and pre-tests described above was that several products were defined for this study. They were: this Multiple Resource Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, survey analysis reports on four parks (Sherman, Dvorak, Columbus and

Humboldt Parks), five sets of mini-historic structures report and a preservation plan for the Chicago Park District.

The survey methodology relies upon historic documentation and evaluation. The study begins with a broad analysis of the park, defining the historic design intents and all of the periods of significance. The parks were then divided into sub-areas, which were based upon logical divisions. The sub-area concept was applied in order to simplify the data collection process. The development of those boundaries varies from park to park depending on integrity, geographic variables, and historic design intent. Within in each sub-area, features are identified and deemed contributing or non-contributing. The determination of contributing and non-contributing features is generally based upon the National Register evaluation of historic resources. However, due to issues associated with designed historic landscapes, a large weight is attributed to the evaluation of how features relate to the historic design intents of the park. An analysis of each feature is then made, including recommendations for rehabilitation and restoration.

In addition to these efforts, the Chicago Park District has adopted its own internal landmarks program. To administer this program, conduct research, and develop the archival collection, a division of preservation planning was created as part of a new Department of Research and Planning. The staff of three consists of Julia Sniderman, Planning Supervisor; William Tippens, Architectural Historian, and John Smith, Curator of Special Collections. As the division services outside research requests, the staff members are increasingly aware of current scholarly research efforts related to the historic parks.

Morrow, Baker H. A Dictionary of Landscape Architecture, Alburquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1987.

Newton, Norman. Design on the Land. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1971.

Olmsted, Frederick Law. Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns. . New York: 1871.

Ranney, Victoria Post. Olmsted in Chicago.. Chicago: Open Lands Project, 1972.

Wille, Lois. Forever Open, Clear, and Free: The Historic Struggle for Chicago's Lakefront. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1971.

Zueblin, Charles. A Decade of Civic Improvement in Chicago. Chicago, 1905.

Annual Reports:

Annual Reports of the South Park Commission, 1872-1910.

Annual Reports of the West Chicago Park Commission, 1872-1928

Report of the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, 1913-1916.

Newspapers:

Chicago American, December 12, 1901, Lincoln Park Commissioners scrapbooks, Chicago Park District Special Collections.

Chicago Tribune, February 26, 1902, LPC scrapbooks, Chicago Park District Special Collections.

Chicago Examiner,February 5, 1904, LPC scrapbooks, Chicago Park District Special Collections.

Chicago Post, January 24, 1906, LPC scrapbook, Chicago Park District Special Collections.

Henderson, Harold. "To Make the Prairie Speak: The Life and Art of a Forgotten Prophet, Chicago Landscape Architect Jens Jensen." Chicago Reader. Vol. 15, No. 5. October 25, 1985.

Bennett, Edward, Monitor (city unknown), December 30, 1926.

Manuscripts:

Jensen, Jens. "Siftings," unpublished manuscript. Jens Jensen Collection, Morton Arboretum.

Letter from Olmsted Brothers to Henry C. Foster, December 7, 1903. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division.

Letter from D. H. Burnham to Mr. Ware, Burnham Library Archives, Art Institute of Chicago.

Articles:

Cleveland, H. W. S. "Extracts from 'Landscape Architecture as Applied to the Wants of the West.'" Billerica, Vol. 4, no. 4, part 2, 1915.

Collier, Malcolm. "Jens Jensen and Columbus Park," Chicago History, Winter, 1975, p. 225-235.

Eaton, Leonard K. "Jens Jensen and the Chicago School," Progressive Architcture, v. 41, pp. 144-50, December, 1960.

Elliott, Thomas, "Daniel Burnham: A Consistent Classicist," Classical America. 4, 1977.

Foreman, Henry. "Chicago's New Park Service," Century Magazine, 69, #4, p. 611. 1905.

Jensen, Jens. "The Naturalistic Treatment in a Metropolitan Park," American Landscape Architecture, January, 1930.

McMarthy, Michael P. "Politics and the Parks--Chicago Businessmen and the Recreation Movement," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, v. 65, 1975, pp. 158-72.

Rainey, Reuben. "A Prairie Metamorphosis: William LeBaron Jenney's Vision of Chicago's Central Park," . Threshold, Univeristy of Illinois Press, (in press).

Tippens, William W. & Sniderman, Julia. "Plans and Designs of Chicago's Neighborhood Parks," A Breath of Fresh Air: Chicago's Neighborhood Parks of the Progressive Reform Era, 1900-25. Chicago: Chicago Public Library, 1989.

Tishler, William H. & Luckhardt, Virginia S. "H. W. S. Cleveland: Pioneer Landscape Architect to the Upper Midwest." Minnesota History, Fall, 1985.

Turak, Theodore. "William LeBaron Jenney: Pioneer of Chicago's West Parks." Inland Architect, 25 (March 1981), pp. 39- 45.

Wilson, Richard Guy. "Alfred Caldwell Illuminates." Landscape Architecture Magazine. September 1977, pp. 407-412.

Documents:

Cairns, Malcolm & Kesler, Gary. Historic Landscape Evaluation & Conservation Plan, Riverside, Illinois, April, 1986.

Chicago City Manual, Chicago, 1914.

Commission on Chicago Historical and Architectural Landmarks. "The Villa District: Preliminary survey of information." Chicago: Commission on Chicago Historical and Architectural Landmarks, 1980, revised 1982.

Keller, J. Timothy and Genvevieve P. Keller. "How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes." National Register Bulletin, # 18. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1988.

Rauch, Dr. John. "Public Parks: Their Effects upon the moral, physical and sanitary condition of the Inhabitants of large cities; with special reference to the City of Chicago," Chicago, 1868.

Special Parks Commission. A Plea for Playgrounds, Chicago, 1905

Vinci, John and Christy, Stephen. Inventory and Evaluation of the Historic Parks in the City of Chicago, 3 volumes. Prepared for the Department of Planning, City of Chicago, 1982.

Walmsley & Company, Inc. A Proposal for the Chicago Park District for Master Plan, Design, and Construction for Three Historic Parks, November, 1987

Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.). Historical Register of the Twenty-two Superseded Park Districts, 3 volumes. Chicago Park District, 1941.

West Chicago Park Commission. Playgrounds and Recreation Centers of the West Park Commission, 1917.

West Chicago Park Commission. Recreation Centers, Playgrounds, and Swimming pools of the West Park Commissioners, 1919.

Historic Photographs, Plans, & Drawings:

Drawing by John C. Olmsted, December 3, 1903. Drawing Collection, Olmsted National Historic Site, Brookline, Mass.

Photographs, plans, and drawings. Chicago Park District Special Collections.